

THE MONTH

A CATHOLIC MAGAZINE



NO. 458 (NEW SERIES 68) AUGUST, 1902

CONTENTS

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE IN BELGIUM	<i>By Austin Oates, K.S.G.</i>	113
THE SUPPRESSION OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.	<i>By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith</i>	126
THE GROUNDS OF LOYALTY	<i>By the Rev. Joseph Rickaby</i>	153
COPTISM	<i>By F. W. Fuller</i>	160
THE POLITICS OF THE ENGLISH CATHOLICS DURING THE REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH	<i>By the Rev. J. H. Pollen</i>	176
OUR POPULAR DEVOTIONS. VI. The so-called Bridgettine Rosary.	<i>By the Rev. Herbert Thurston</i>	189
FLOTSAM AND JETSAM		204
REVIEWS		208
LITERARY RECORD		221

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO
LONDON & ONE SHILLING

Scripture Manuals for Catholic Schools.

Edited by the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S.J.

COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. MARK. By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. Crown 8vo, boards, with Map, 2s. 6d.

This volume forms one of the Scripture Manuals for Catholic Schools, which, while intended primarily to meet the requirements of the Local Examinations, are also adapted for general use in schools, and will be found serviceable by all who wish to acquire an intelligent understanding of the historical books of the New Testament.

St. Matthew. By the Rev. JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. Crown 8vo, boards, with Map, 2s. 6d.

St. Luke. By the Rev. J. W. DARBY, O.S.B., and the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. Crown 8vo, 296 pp., boards, with Map, 2s. 6d.

St. John. By the Rev. JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. Crown 8vo, boards, with Map, 2s.

Acts. Part I. (Chapters i.—xvi.). By the Very Rev. T. A. BURGE, O.S.B. Second Edition. Crown 8vo, boards, with Map, 2s.

Acts. Part II. (Chapters xiii.—xxviii.). By the Very Rev. T. A. BURGE, O.S.B. Third Edition. Crown 8vo, boards, with Map, 1s. 6d.

Most serviceable for Teachers, and an admirable Gift-Book
for First Communicants.

FIRST COMMUNION.

EDITED BY

FATHER THURSTON, S.J.

Third and Cheaper Edition.

Crown 8vo, 496 and xxiv. pp., with 19 Illustrations.

PRICE 3s. 6d.

LONDON: BURNS & OATES (LIMITED), 28, ORCHARD-STREET, W.

Universal Suffrage in Belgium.

ONE of the tests of the human constitution is said to be its power of resistance against attacks and disorders arising from within and without its own organism. If this can be applied to a political body the present Catholic Government of Belgium must assuredly be considered as endowed with exceptional vigour and robustness.

During an administration extending over a period of eighteen years it has weathered a series of storms as varied and as violent as it can ever have fallen to the lot of a Catholic Continental Cabinet to encounter. Not a few have been the outcome of dissensions from within its own body, the almost inevitable results of a policy which aims at effecting great reforms. But by far the more mischievous and menacing have come from the side of its opponents. The present Belgian Opposition represents every phase and shade of the most advanced forms of Continental Liberalism, Radicalism, and Socialism. Each section of this motley whole has its leader and followers in and out of Parliament. Each has a policy and programme of its own which it regards as the sole specific for the evils of the day. Each seeks to force its *nostrum* upon the country at large. Their quarrels amongst themselves are interminable, and render utterly impossible the promulgation of a common programme.

Yet they have one aim in common. Ever since the June of 1884, when the Liberal Party under the late M. Frère-Orban was overthrown and reduced to a condition of almost political impotency, the one main object of his routed and riotous forces, ever egged on by the rising faction of Socialists, has been, by fair means or by foul, to effect the overthrow of the Government. The old rallying cry of *À bas les Cléricaux* was one no longer to conjure with. It was impossible to rekindle the drenched embers of anti-clericalism, all but extinguished in the crushing

defeat of their forces by the Catholic electorate in 1884. A new cry must be found, one more specious and insidious by which the sorely-stricken and scattered stragglers of the vanquished party might, once again, be cajoled into rejoining the ranks with a view to further action against the victors. It was soon found, and took the form of a cry for a revision of the Constitution in the sense of an extension of the Parliamentary franchise, later on to be formulated into an express demand for Universal Suffrage.

That an extension, and a very large extension, of the franchise was called for, and must, sooner or later, be granted, M. Beernaert, the Leader of the Catholic party, had publicly avowed on the eve of the eventful election of 1884. He then pledged himself and his followers to deal with the question if returned to office; a pledge which obtained the unanimous approval of the representatives of all the Federated Catholic Clubs and Associations throughout the country.

The initiative, therefore, in this matter did not lie with the Opposition, though, doubtless, they considerably hastened its introduction into Parliament by fomenting throughout their constituencies a series of agitations of a more or less disorderly character. In these tactics the Socialists, even as far back as 1886, were conspicuously to the fore, and loud in their appeal to the masses to insist upon universal suffrage, and to be satisfied with nothing else.

It was not until 1892 that M. Beernaert saw his way clear to proceed to the redemption of his promise. Before considering his policy, and that which superseded it and eventually became law, it will be well to review briefly the Parliamentary system then in force, as also the position of Parties in the Chamber of Representatives and in the Senate.

The Chamber of Representatives was composed of members chosen directly by all citizens who had reached or passed their twenty-first year, and paid direct taxes to the annual amount of forty-three francs (=£1 15s. 10d.). The number of Deputies was fixed in proportion to the population, and could not exceed one member for 40,000 inhabitants. The Senate was composed of exactly one half the number of the Chamber of Representatives, and its members were elected by the same electors. The Senators were elected for eight years, while Deputies were elected but for four. Both the Senate and the Chamber sought re-election in one moiety every four years.

The Parliamentary position of Parties in 1892 was as follows:

House of Representatives : Catholics, 92 ; Liberals, 60.

Senate " 46 " 30.

Thus there was a Catholic majority of 32 in the House of Representatives and of 16 in the Senate. For ordinary legislative purposes this majority was in both Houses more than sufficient. But it ceased to be so when a revision of any of the articles of the Constitution was in contemplation. One of the articles decreed that no revision could take place unless *two-thirds* of the members of both Houses voted in its favour. In neither House were the Catholics in sufficient force to carry any revisionary measure by their own party vote. Their only chance lay in the possibility of securing the adhesion of the members forming what was known as the Moderate Section of the Liberal Party. Failing this matters would be at a deadlock.

Such was the position of Parties and affairs when M. Beernaert introduced in 1892 his measure for the extension of the franchise. It was based upon the English system of household suffrage, and provided for a re-distribution of seats. Eventually the scheme, with others, was referred to a Parliamentary Consultative Committee. By this Committee a proposal recommending universal suffrage was promptly rejected by 16 votes to 4. That of the Premier, M. Beernaert, was accepted and it was eventually carried in the House of Representatives, but by a majority which failed to secure two-thirds of the votes of the whole House. The situation was a serious one both inside and outside of Parliament. The country was now in an extremely agitated state. The Socialists studiously fostered and fanned riotous demonstrations in all the industrial and mining centres throughout the country, and were only too successful in inducing a very large number of operatives to come out on strike. Concerning this new phase of their plan of campaign we shall have something to say later on.

It was at this critical stage that M. Nyssens, a Progressive Catholic, brought forward a scheme founded on the principle of universal suffrage, but tempered and toned down by a plural vote based on the possession of certain qualifications. This proposal obtained the requisite two-thirds majority of votes in both Houses and became law in the September of 1893.¹

¹ It was voted in the House of Representatives by 119 ayes to 14 noes, and 12 abstentions. In the Senate 52 recorded a vote in favour of the Bill, 1 against it, and 14 abstained from voting. The majority in both Chambers included several members of the Progressists and Moderate Liberals.

Its provisions were as follows :

As regards the election of Representatives: Every citizen over twenty-five years, not civilly disqualified, was entitled to a vote. Every citizen over thirty-five years, married or a widower, with legitimate issue, and paying 5 francs a year in house-tax, as also every citizen over twenty-five years owning immovable property to the value of 2,000 francs, or having a corresponding income, was to have a supplementary vote. Two supplementary votes were given to citizens over twenty-five years who had received diplomas or certificates of higher education. But no elector was to be entitled to have more than three votes in all. The number of Representatives to be elected was to be proportioned to the population, and could not exceed one for every 40,000. They were to be elected for a period of four years, one half retiring every two years, except after a dissolution.

The Senate was to consist of members elected for eight years, partly directly and partly indirectly. The number of those to be elected directly was proportioned to the population of each province, and was equal to half the number of members of the Chamber of Representatives. The constituent body was to be similar to that which elected the latter. Senators elected indirectly were to be chosen by the Provincial Councils, two for each province of less than 500,000 inhabitants, three for each province with a population up to 1,000,000, and four for each province with over 1,000,000. No candidate could be chosen who had been a member of the Council electing him during two years preceding the election. The Senatorial qualification required that each candidate should be forty years of age, paying not less than 1,200 francs in direct taxation and possessing immovable property of an annual value of 12,000 francs.

With the passing of this Act the electorate in the country was increased ten-fold; from 136,775 it rose at a bound to 1,370,687, or one half of the total male population. The measure not only contained the adoption of the principle of universal suffrage, but tempered its application by the bestowal of supplementary votes upon those who possessed a greater stake in the community. The conditions constituting this greater stake, and entitling to the supplementary vote, are by no means prohibitive. They are within the easy reach of the vast majority of the electorate, and as we shall presently show, have been claimed and secured by a very large proportion of the working-classes. A common objection to this Act

has been that it withdrew with one hand what it gave with the other. This was certainly not the case. While conferring a vote upon every citizen enjoying civil rights, it recognized the inequality of his political rights by endeavouring to apportion the influence of which each one disposed in an election according to the intellectual and social guarantees which he could offer for the peace and prosperity of the country.

That the new Act favoured the democracy is abundantly proved by the following figures. 462,831 electors, or thirty-one per cent., were of the industrial classes; 428,951, or thirty-one per cent., were engaged in agriculture, while but 84,734, or six per cent., of the electorate were members of the liberal professions, and 38,326, or three per cent., were landed proprietors, and persons of independent means (*rentiers et pensionnés*).¹

The first practical application of the new electoral Reform Act took place the year following, in the October of 1894, in an Election which was the result of a Cabinet crisis. M. Beernaert introduced a measure having for its object an electoral system of proportional representation. It gave rise to serious dissensions in the Cabinet and was thrown out in the Chamber of Representatives by seventy-six votes to fifty. This brought about M. Beernaert's resignation of the Premiership; a reconstruction of the Ministry, and eventually the dissolution of the Chambers, and a General Election under the new Act, which, we should add, made voting compulsory.

The results were eminently favourable to the Catholic party, disastrous in the extreme to the old Liberal section, and a veritable triumph for the Socialists. The position of Parties as represented in the new Parliament compared with that of the old will be seen from the following table.

	Catholics.	Liberals.	Socialists.	Total.	Catholic Maj.
1893.					
Chamber of Representatives ...	92	60	—	152	32
Senate ...	46	30	—	76	16
1894.					
Chamber of Representatives ...	104	19	29	152	56
Senate ...	52	24	—	76	28

¹ Official statistics from the Electoral Returns of 1890.

The salient feature of this Election under the new Act was the victory of the Socialists at the expense of the Liberal party, whose veteran leader, M. Frère-Orban, was unseated in these memorable and fateful polls of 1894. The defeat of the Liberals was due to their halting attitude on the Electoral Reform question. With the more moderate of the party universal suffrage was a political abomination, yet as a party they refused to rally against it, and contented themselves with a policy of *laissez-aller*. They were still anti-clerical, even if no partisans of universal suffrage. They would risk the advent of the latter sooner than ally themselves with their old enemies the Catholics. And *laissez-aller* was the electorate's response to them as a Party, for as a political force they were practically wiped out, and on their ruins Socialism arose menacing and triumphant.

And now a word as to this Party which had become a power in the State and was soon to become a danger. With its economic policy we are not now concerned, and will confine ourselves to the political aspects of its policy and organization.

What is now known as the *Parti ouvrier* was founded in 1885 upon the lines of the *Internationale*, which had existed, if not thrived, since 1848, and came to an inglorious end in 1873. The present organization consists of a General Council elected annually by delegates chosen by the twenty-six Regional Federations. Affiliated to and in constant touch with these Federations are all the Socialist Clubs, Associations, Co-operative and Mutual Benefit Societies, &c., of the country. The sinews of war are derived from levies made upon these various enterprises and agencies. Its one great object in view is, according to its organ, *Le Peuple* (November 2, 1898), "to unite together the working-classes for the purpose of securing political supremacy, as well as that of the sole direction of the social economics of Society."

The leaders promised their followers that if returned to Parliament they would advocate and agitate for the separation of Church and State; the suppression of the Budget of Public Worship; the confiscation of all property belonging to ecclesiastical corporations; the abolition of conscription; the fixing of a minimum living wage; a vast system of State Insurance by which a competency should be assured every individual working-man during sickness and old age, and a progressive income-tax. They would replace the present system of production by one

based upon the common possession of the soil, minerals, the necessary machinery, &c., &c.

All this, and more than all this, was tendered as a tempting bait to the proletariat as obtainable through universal suffrage, and dupes were found in thousands to bite at it. The long and successive terms of Liberal administration had but too well prepared the ground upon which these dangerous, insidious, and finally revolutionary tenets were to take root and flourish. Notably from 1879 to 1884 no effort had been spared to de-Christianize the masses, above all those toiling in the mining and industrial centres. The schools had been not only secularized, but paganized. The Church, the clergy, the religious men and women had been held up to execration and subject to an odious and unrelenting persecution. A licentious, ribald, and materialist press enjoyed an unbridled freedom without restraint, propagating pornography and open blasphemy. Small wonder then that in the Wallon provinces and other centres of Socialism the rising generation of those years, the electors of to-day, are imbued with principles which have borne their fruit in bloodshed and anarchy.

Jubilant, indeed, was the Socialist party with the verdict of the October Elections of 1894. Their organ, *Le Peuple*, wrote: "The results have filled us with joy, but not with surprise. They are just what we expected. The toilers have not allowed themselves to be turned aside, the army of misery has ranged itself behind the red flag to the cry of *Place aux Pauvres*."

They awoke to the full realization of their strength. They had polled in constituencies where contests had taken place 305,311 votes, to the Liberals' 554,752, and the Catholics' 927,628. In the partial Parliamentary Elections held in 1896 and 1898 they still further increased their voting strength, polling 465,201 and 493,535 respectively, while the Liberal vote showed a steady decrease, being that of 407,465 in 1896, and 385,936 in 1898. The Catholic total vote rose from 937,240 in 1896 to 946,223 in 1898, an increase of barely 20,000 votes in four years, as against that of 190,000 gained by the Socialists in the same period. The position of parties in the House of Representatives was 111 Catholics, 12 Liberals and 29 Socialists; in 1898 the Catholics had won a seat and the Socialists had lost one. The Liberals were as before.

The following year, 1899, was a painfully eventful one in the history of the country. There were dissensions in the

Ministry and their Party, disorders and riots in the capital and other towns of the kingdom. The Premier, M. De Smet de Nayer, and certain of his colleagues resigned office owing to their objection to a Bill for establishing uninominal voting which the King had desired should be introduced. On the reconstruction of the Cabinet, M. Vandenpeereboom, the new Prime Minister, brought forward a Bill for the representation of the minorities in Parliament. This measure, if passed, was intended to be tentative and applicable only to certain towns and districts. But the Socialists would have none of it, and set on foot as lawless and riotous an agitation as ever sought to coerce a Continental Cabinet.

Speaking in the Chamber of Representatives on June 29, 1899, their leader, M. Vandervelde, delivered himself of the following ultimatum at a moment when the House was surrounded by a howling mob of his followers: "Yesterday, here in Brussels, you saw the gathering of our forces—forces ready and prepared to march hand in hand to resist a Government of pickpockets and liars. You are preparing a *Coup d'État*; against its preparation we have a right to appeal to the electorate. I move the adjournment of the House. If you refuse it, I will appeal to the King! If he refuses to receive me, there is still before us the recourse to revolutionary methods, and these we intend to employ. Now do as you like. You are warned."

Then, leaving the House, the Socialist leader proceeded to harangue in language more violent and inflammatory the rowdy and riotous rabble outside. These were awaiting orders, eager and ready to execute them. They received them, and during the three consecutive days and nights Brussels was practically at their mercy. As days passed the situation became more critical. The frequent adjournments of the House put a temporary stop to the humiliating series of disreputable scenes within its walls only to let loose the instigators and perpetrators to further fan and foment the fury of the deluded fanatics without.

Nor was the "agitation" confined to the capital. Socialist agents were actively at work at Liège, Mons, Charleroi, and elsewhere, inciting the working-men engaged in the coal and iron industries to come out on strike, not for shorter hours or increased wage, but to throw up both work and wage that they might swell the ranks of the mob in the capital, and by violence

and intimidation coerce the Ministry into the withdrawal of a measure of which not one in a thousand of the unfortunate agitators had the slightest knowledge, and in which they had not the faintest interest. The calling out of such forces was a new departure in Socialist tactics, and the ready response to the summons wore an ugly aspect.

The Ministry gave way. The Bill was withdrawn and the question of Proportional Representation was relegated to the consideration of a Committee composed of all parties. A Government with a following of 111 members, in a House composed of 154, with the largest, the most loyal majority that ever backed a Belgian Ministry, yielded to the seditious and treasonable words and deeds of 29 Socialists backed by the foul-mouthed yells and imprecations of a riotous rabble. To stop the effusion of blood, to stem the rising tide of tumult and insurrection, was the motive of the surrender, a surrender which left the field of battle in the hands of the Socialists.

The new Catholic Ministry, under M. De Smet de Nayer, still determined upon the passing of a measure dealing with the claim of the minorities to a Parliamentary representation. They felt that the state of things was scarcely equitable which excluded from representation large numbers of citizens throughout the country. In the Wallon provinces thousands of Catholics were utterly unable to return to Parliament a single representative of their opinions, while in the Flemish provinces masses of Liberal electors found themselves in the same condition of helplessness.

The measure introduced rested on a somewhat complicated numerical calculation of the proportion between the total number of votes recorded and those cast for each particular list of candidates, and was calculated to secure, and eventually did secure a fair adjustment of the numbers returned to the political views of the electorate. The Bill obtained the requisite majorities in both Houses, and was voted December 24, 1899.

The Government, in urging its acceptance upon Parliament, knew well enough that its passing must inevitably bring about a reduction of their large majorities both in the Senate and the House of Representatives. Once it became law the days of big majorities had gone by. Yet they believed the Bill to be an honest and loyal attempt to redress a grievous inequality in the franchise. The results amply bore out this expectation

in the General Elections, which took place in the following May, when the working of the new Act was put to a practical test.

The returns showed that 86 Catholics, 34 Liberals, and 31 Socialists had been returned as members of the House of Representatives. The gains were with the Socialists and the Liberals, who owe to this Act their reappearance as a party in the political arena. The losses were on the side of the Catholics, who forfeited 26 seats, leaving them with a reduced majority of 20.

It need hardly be said that the Socialists were by no means satisfied with the results. They clamoured for universal suffrage *pur et simple* for all citizens aged twenty-one years and over, and the abolition of all plural votes, in spite of the fact that in two of their chief strongholds, Charleroi and Mons, the proportion of electors possessing plural votes is respectively 44 per cent. and 47 per cent. They set on foot an agitation systematically and skilfully planned, which culminated in the riots and disorders beginning on the 20th of March, and only terminating on the 20th April of this year. These disgraceful disturbances, resulting in serious loss of life, the pillaging of some three hundred houses and an estimated loss of over ten millions of francs in damage to property and working men's wages, &c., have demonstrated more clearly and forcibly than any argument could have done, that the masses in Belgium under Socialist leaders cannot yet be safely entrusted with universal suffrage *pur et simple*.

It will be interesting and instructive to trace briefly the history of this recent rising of the Socialist forces, and of the means and the measures they took to bring it to a successful issue.

At a meeting of the Socialists of Brussels, held at their head-quarters, *La Maison du Peuple*, the 5th July, 1901, the citizen Elbers, President of the *Fédération Bruxelloise*, said, in the course of a speech, "We have worked long enough, what avails it that we have members of Parliament or that we have recourse to propagandism? We must and will have universal suffrage this year at all cost. If it has to cost blood and men must fall, then blood will flow and men will perish, but universal suffrage we will have."

M. Vandervelde, their leader in and out of Parliament, speaking in the November of last year, at the *Nouvelle Cour de Bruxelles*, said: "Have confidence! only nine months

separate us from the Elections ; if the Government reject our pacific overtures, even then nothing will be lost ; for, as Marx has said : *La force est l'accoucheuse du droit.*"

Their organ, *Le Peuple*, in the month of February, distributed largely amongst its readers at ludicrously nominal prices, as a species of coupon prize, revolvers and cartridges, while the Socialist organ of Ghent, the *Vooruit*, in its number of the 5th April, gave a recipe for the manufacture of dynamite, and the Socialists of that town, when "manifesting" in favour of universal suffrage, sang—

En geeftmen ons het stemrecht niet
Den smijten wij met dynamiet,

which may be translated to mean that, "if to vote they won't give us the right, then we'll begin to throw dynamite"—a threat which subsequent events proved to be anything but an idle one.

The Government persisting in their refusal to yield to threats and to grant a further revision of the Constitution at the dictation of the Socialists, and the arrangements of the latter being now complete for an appeal to violence, M. Vandervelde announced to his followers at the *Maison du Peuple*, that "the pear was ripe, let us proceed to pluck it."

On the eve of April rioting took place simultaneously at Charleroi, Liège, Mons, Brussels, Huy, Louvain, Verviers, Namur, Tournay, &c. Dynamite outrages occurred at Binche and La Louvière. At Brussels an attempt was made to blow up the National Bank ; the windows of the Convent of the Dames de Marie, in the same town, were smashed ; the orphanage of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, in the Rue des Minimes, would have been burnt to the ground but for the intervention of the military. Frequent sanguinary encounters took place between the rioters and the police and soldiery, resulting in eight persons being killed and over a hundred wounded. The list of outrages committed included twenty dynamite explosions, fourteen attempts at train wrecking, and the destruction and pillage of some three hundred houses.

But the Government remained firm, meeting force with force, and quelled the insurrection promptly and vigorously. Then followed the general strike, presumably of some 350,000 working-men, if any reliance whatsoever can be placed upon the Socialist organs. Be this as it may, the men soon realized the

folly of their proceedings, and after three days' holiday, returned peaceably and prosaically to their work.

The riot once quelled, the strike brought to a close, and law and order restored throughout the country, the Government gave facilities for the discussion of a proposal to revise the Constitution. It was negatived by 84 votes to 64. The Prime Minister, M. De Smet de Nayer, in opposing the motion, declared that any further extension of the franchise was not the wish of the country.

The partial Elections held in May last certainly seemed to confirm the Premier's view of the sense of the electorate. One half of the Chamber of Representatives, and that the half in which the Catholic members predominated, had to be re-elected. But in addition to this there were fourteen new seats to be filled. The Government retained all their old seats, and gained two new seats at Antwerp, and one at each of the following places: Brussels, Bruges, Verviers, Namur, Ghent, and Alost. The Socialists won three seats, at Liège, Charleroi, and Soignies, while the Liberals lost one at Brussels and gained one at Dinant.

The position of parties in the House of Representatives is now as follows: Catholics 96, Socialists 34, Liberals 34, Christian Democrats 2; giving thus a Catholic majority of 26 as against one of 20 in the last Parliament. In the Senate the Catholic majority is 14. The total number of votes polled by the successful Catholic candidates was 842,232, or 51 per cent. of the total electorate. By the Socialists in favour of universal suffrage 383,482, or 23 per cent. of the total electorate. The Liberals obtained 369,765. Compared with the total votes recorded at the Elections of 1900, those polled by the Catholics in 1902 showed an increase of 77,698, those of the Socialists 15,133, and those of the Liberals 2,971. As against the united votes of Socialists and Liberals the Catholics obtained a majority of 88,985.

Bearing in mind that the issue before the electorate was that of universal suffrage, *pur et simple*, and that but 383,482 votes were recorded in its favour out of a total of 1,595,479 polled, M. De Smet de Nayer's contention that the country was opposed to it is placed beyond question. What the votes recorded in favour of the Liberal candidates actually mean on the question of universal suffrage it is impossible to say. It may, however, be safely assumed that a very large proportion of

them were hostile to the issue raised by M. Vandervelde and his followers in the polls of 1902.

M. Vandervelde, writing on the 29th of April last to the *Vorwärts*, the Socialist organ of Berlin, in reference to the then forthcoming Elections in Belgium, said: "The conquest of political equality by a conscious and organized proletariat which in Belgium represents one per cent. of the population, a percentage lighter than that of any other country, this conquest would have in a measure the indication of the beginning of a social revolution and a decisive step forward in the road which leads to the possession of public power."

The decisive step forward, as far as Socialism in Belgium is concerned, was not made on the 29th of May. That day recorded the country's verdict on the scenes of bloodshed and riot provoked and perpetrated in last April by M. Vandervelde and his followers. It has decided, and that with no uncertain voice, that the peace and prosperity of the country cannot and shall not be wholly and solely entrusted to a proletariat which seeks its aims by methods of crime and violence.

AUSTIN OATES.

The Suppression of the Society of Jesus.

VII.—THE SUPPRESSION IN SPAIN (3).

WE have seen what kind of a case against the Spanish Jesuits was formulated in the *Memoria Ministerial*, and have inferred that it was an indictment substantially the same which was laid before the King in the *Consulta* of January 29, 1767, and induced him to expel them from his dominions. If it was a true portrait of the incriminated Religious we must admit that they were a most disturbing force to have in a country, but, as was pointed out in the last article, this *Memoria Ministerial* is an accusation only, conceived in the most indefinite terms and unaccompanied by any proofs, whereas it is the proofs which we require to have before we can judge of the justice or injustice of the expulsion. Our task, therefore, in the present article must be to ascertain what proofs underlay the accusation, and to judge of their sufficiency.

It is a task not free from difficulty for two reasons. One is that we have not had personal access to the numerous papers bearing on the subject which are to be found in the Spanish Archives, and must depend on the published works of others, namely, of the three authors mentioned in the last article, Don Gutierrez de la Huerta, Señor Ferrer del Rio, and Señor Danvila y Collado. The impression produced on one by reading even the latest and most thorough of these three is that there is much material still unpublished which will some day yield rich results. Still they were competent investigators, and we may assume without risk that what they have given fairly represents the whole, so that we shall not be seriously astray in resting our judgment upon it. The other reason which makes our present task difficult is of a more radical kind. The Extraordinary Council over which the Conde de Aranda presided was invested by the King with the most ample powers to choose its methods of procedure, and it seems to have con-

sidered itself free to neglect the ordinary forms of justice whenever it thought fit. Thanks to the device of dealing with the Jesuits by an administrative measure instead of by judicial procedure not a single Jesuit was put on his trial, or allowed to make a deposition—which means to say that in no case have we their version of the deeds imputed to them, and, what is more, in no case probably was their version laid before the King. Nor in the instance or two that we have of the judicial proceedings against persons accused of having been their instruments and accomplices is there that completeness which leaves a satisfied feeling in the mind. In short, we can obtain a few further details of the charges than we could get from a document like the *Memoria Ministerial*, but still only charges the substantiation of which is concealed from us. What this means is that in forming our judgment we are thrown back on the character of the judges, all of whom were the specially selected agents of an Extraordinary Council which, to put it mildly, was not without a strong prejudice against the accused. In England, the England at all events of the present day, an investigation thus conducted would have no chance whatever of commanding public confidence, and we might perhaps content ourselves with taking refuge in this consideration. We desire, however, to carry as far as the documents will allow an investigation so closely affecting the reputation of the Society.

The *Memoria Ministerial* places in the foreground the alleged complicity of the Jesuits in the Madrid Insurrection of 1766. What precedes in this document assigns a motive as explaining why the Jesuits should wish to cause commotions in the country, and describes a supposed campaign of calumny by which they prepared the minds of the people for a revolt against their rulers; whilst what follows in the same document is of the nature of a generalization, charging them with similar offences in the provincial towns, and likewise in South America; all being intended to lead up to the conclusion that it would be an insufficient remedy to punish merely the few individuals who might be convicted of definite offences, but that it was necessary to put an end to the entire body. We may observe here incidentally, that in the *Consulta* of April 30 1767, this generalization is carried further, the Madrid Insurrection being in fact treated as a somewhat minor link in the chain of offences, for constituting which the whole past

history of the Society in the various countries of the earth is exploited.

It is obvious that we must pass over now this extensive generalization, though in some degree it will be necessary to return to it when we come to an examination of the Brief of Suppression of Clement XIV. Still in passing it over we may cite the judgment of Gutierrez de la Huerta, who in his *Dictamen* notes the skill with which the effect has been produced, by omitting all in the history of the Society which was to its credit and had gained for it the appreciation of rulers and people, and painting in the strongest colours, to the exclusion of all shades and half-tones, the comparatively fewer episodes which might be made to tell against it.

On the question of the motives which the Jesuits are alleged to have had for disturbing the country, it will be enough to say that the dismissal of Padre Rábago, the Jesuit confessor to Ferdinand VI., and the dismissal of the Marques de la Ensenada from the leading post in the Ministry, were the result of a Court intrigue. There were at that time two parties among the courtiers of King Ferdinand VI., one desiring an alliance with England and Portugal against France, and the other an alliance with France against England and Portugal. Richard Wall, a Spanish statesman of Irish nationality, was leader of the pro-English party, with which naturally Sir Benjamin Keene, the English Ambassador, was in league; and Ensenada was leader of the pro-French party. The pro-English party were in favour of the Treaty of Limits which proved so disastrous to the Paraguayan Missions as well as to the interests of Spain, and in this way Padre Rábago became involved along with Ensenada, both of whom offered a strenuous opposition to the treaty and its consequences. Wall was moreover a strong anti-Jesuit, as his letters bear witness, and, when his party became the stronger, they managed to contrive the dismissal of both Ensenada and Rábago.

Padre Rábago was the last Jesuit confessor at the Spanish Court, and his dismissal was followed by a gradual leavening of the high offices of Church and State with incumbents adverse to the Society—a process which continued and became enlarged when Carlos III. succeeded his brother on the throne. It was but natural that the Jesuits should be mortified at this change, and should use language in word or writing expressive of their wounded feelings—in criticism, for instance, of the

unpalatable appointments—some of which language was unreasonable and indefensible, and some perhaps really scandalous. We are not aware of any extant evidence that this happened, but there may be, and as Jesuits being human have among them at all times their fair share of imperfect and imprudent characters, it is likely that such things happened then, and it may be assumed that they did. But to be guilty of this kind of intemperate action is one thing, to be guilty of an organized effort to regain lost power and influence by resorting to the most evil means, striving to fill the country with seditions, forming plots against its rulers, and even attempts to assassinate its Sovereign—that is quite another thing, and a kind of guilt which ought not to be imputed to any class of men whatever, still less to a body of men dedicated to the service of God, except on the most convincing array of positive evidence. And yet where is there a trace of such evidence to be found? Certainly there is none in the *Memoria Ministerial* nor in any *Consulta* out of the many which the campaign against the Society called forth, nor does Señor Ferrer del Rio produce any, though he certainly would have done so if he could. On the other hand, it is easy to see why this assignment of motive finds its place in the *Memoria Ministerial*. As we shall find, Aranda and his colleagues had no positive evidence worthy of the name to connect the Jesuits with the Madrid Insurrection. Their proof, such as it was, was inferential—the Insurrection must have been due to the Jesuits because they were the people who had a motive for wishing it. In other words, these documents, by which the King was persuaded to take the severest action against a multitude of his subjects, argued in a vicious circle. They proved the supposed guilty conduct of the Jesuits from the motives by which they were supposed to be animated; and they proved the supposed motives from the supposed conduct.

It may seem premature to suggest at the present stage this judgment on the reasoning of the *Memoria Ministerial*, but it will be helpful to keep it in mind whilst we study the evidence they could produce for connecting the Jesuits with the Insurrection—to which study we have now to pass.

We may take as a basis the report of Don Gutierrez, supplementing it where required from our two other authorities. It is towards the end of his *Dictamen* that he comes to the question

of the Insurrection. After briefly narrating the history of this event, he tells us that "ever since the time of Ferdinand VI. the enemies of the Society had been on the look-out for an opportunity to destroy it, and they seized upon the Madrid Insurrection as one made ready to their hands." They persuaded the King that this rising "could not have been the work of the wretched mob which cried out in the streets, but must be due to the Jesuits, who were accustomed to tumults, rebellions, and regicides, and had infected the nation with the fanaticism they were wont to infuse into their friends and adherents; that a large number of these adherents were to be found at the Court itself, astute, intriguing, and daring persons, who were prepared for any enterprize; and that the person of the King himself was not safe from danger should it suit the Jesuits to make an attempt upon it—in the hope of being able to overturn the Government, divide its offices among their friends, regain their former absolute and despotic power, recover the Royal confessorship, and destroy by fire and bloodshed those good and loyal subjects whom they regarded as their enemies."

It will be noted how closely this account of the indictment laid before the King corresponds with what we have found in the *Memoria Ministerial*. But it is the proofs of this indictment that we are seeking, and Don Gutierrez, after describing the appointment of the Extraordinary Council, tells us how the Ministers of Carlos III. set to work to obtain them. The *Alcalde de Casa y Corte*, whose name was Cevallos, was commissioned to make inquiries as to the Jesuits at Madrid, and his companions, Leiza and Avila, were to make inquiries as to certain other persons, whilst similar commissions were set up in the country towns to make inquiries there, all being bound to observe the utmost secrecy.

No sooner [says Gutierrez] were these appointments made, than secret spies were disseminated throughout the kingdom; complaints, denunciations, and false testimonies of every kind were encouraged; and favour was shown to all who spoke ill of the Jesuits, and such offices as fell vacant were used to reward friends and multiply partizans.

This corresponds with what we have already heard from Padre Gonzalez, who, in his *Life of Idiaquez*,¹ has related how the Fathers became conscious about that time of an increased

¹ See *THE MONTH* for June, p. 641.

disposition to watch all their utterances, making the most of the smallest indiscretions, and even twisting into a scandalous sense assertions which in themselves were perfectly innocent. But what was the result?

Don Gutierrez tells us that the mass of the witnesses whose testimony was received belonged to the class of those who were the habitual defamers of the Society, and that these, "not knowing of anything bearing on the alleged crime, thought it sufficient to make depositions reciting all the false principles with which the Jesuits have been credited by their adversaries in all time, and on this ground to denounce them as ambitious, mischievous, relaxed in their morals, seditious and malevolent." But

in regard to the Insurrection none mentioned any occurrences save what were useless or of no account, because resting on mere popular rumour instead of personal knowledge. Some said Jesuits in their sermons uttered seditious words; others that in their discourses and conversations they talked against members of the Government; others that in the College (at Madrid) they gave manifestations of joy while the riot was going on; and that from this College first went forth the cries that were afterwards heard in the streets, when the people demanded to have the Marques de la Ensenada back as Minister; and there were even some who said that on the night of the riot a man was seen walking about concealed among the rioters who looked like Padre Isidro Lopez.

This is really all that Don Gutierrez has to say about denunciations directly charging the Jesuits with having a hand in the Insurrection, and apparently nothing was done to test these rumours, as indeed they could not be properly tested without an examination of Padre Lopez and his colleagues. And as neither Ferrer del Rio nor Danvila seem to have found anything more definite, Don Cevallos, the person entrusted with the inquiry into the offences of the Jesuits themselves, must have had an easy time.

But they also sought to reach the Jesuits through prosecution of men whom they took to be their friends. Foremost among these were three well-known persons, one a cleric, the other two laymen, namely, Don Miguel de la Gándara, the Archdeacon of Murcia, Don Lorenzo Hermoso, and the Marques de Villaflores, all of whom were residents at the Court. These are the three to whom the *Memoria Ministerial* refers when it speaks of the Jesuits betraying their guilt by the sorrow with which they

"bewailed . . . the arrest and imprisonment of certain others of their friends."¹ Señor Ferrer del Rio tells us that they were "known to be the leaders of the rioters, and were punished as such, it being impossible for Aranda to spare them." We find too the Nuncio, writing to the Cardinal Secretary of State, just after the publication of the Pragmatic Sanction, and stating that "Campomanes had said that 'the Abate Gándara was more guilty than Damiens in France,' which seemed to imply that he was considered to be a regicide, and it is believed that he will very soon be conducted to the Court Prison, and visited with an appropriate punishment." Here then we have three very important cases which fortunately we can pursue further, as Don Gutierrez has given us a connected account of the interrogatories to which these three supposed leaders of the riot were subjected. We must be content to summarize his account, but shall try to lose nothing of its contents, for so good an opportunity must not be lost of an insight into the character of Aranda's methods and the quality of Señor Ferrer del Rio's judgments.

On the night of October 20th, 1766, the three men were arrested all at the same time, and their papers confiscated. Villaflores was placed in solitary confinement in the Castle of Alicante, Hermoso in that of Pamplona, whilst the Abate Gándara was taken to the Castle of Batres. At the same time Padre Lopez was not indeed arrested, but ordered to retire to Monforte in Galicia. In this way the suspected persons were separated from one another by the whole breadth of the kingdom, the professed object being of course to prevent them from acting in collusion, but the real object being in all probability—as the reader may be inclined to think after hearing what there was to bring against them—to keep away from the Court, where all four had till then been resident, a set of men whose discernment, courage, and high character might have been employed in detecting and explaining to the King the nature of the injustice into which he was being entrapped.

In spite of their arrest [Gutierrez tells us], nothing in any way suspicious was found in their papers, but, on the contrary, much that demonstrated that both they and the Jesuits were entirely innocent of the Madrid Insurrection. Hence, after taking from Gándara, Hermoso, and the Marques de Villaflores simple depositions stating what they had to say about the charges brought against them, it was found necessary to stop the prosecution, there being simply no evidence on which to convict them.

¹ See *THE MONTH* for July, p. 32.

This break-down left the Extraordinary Council in an unpleasant position, for the King was all expectation, having been assured that abundant evidence against the Jesuits would be forthcoming. It was then, thinks Gutierrez, that the expedient of proceeding against them by an administrative act instead of a judicial sentence, suggested itself to the Council. But however that may be, the three men were still kept in confinement, and perhaps were accused of the crime in a guarded manner in the *Consulta* of January 29, as we have seen that they were in the *Memoria Ministerial*. They were also subjected to a further examination in the following autumn, which resulted in some sort of a verdict against them. Let us hear then from Gutierrez the sequel of their case, which he gives with some detail for each person separately.

Hermoso was brought from his prison at Pamplona to the Court prison at Madrid, in December, 1767, but it was not till the following March that they were prepared to administer to him any interrogatories. In the previous spring, when called upon to name the Jesuits with whom he had dealings, he had replied, With none, and that he had never counted among their friends. During the interval they had got hold of four witnesses, of whom one was said to have been a personal attendant on Padre Lopez. This man deposed that previously to the Insurrection Hermoso used to frequent the room of Padre Lopez for secret conferences. The other three witnesses were said to be servants at the Jesuit College, and merely testified to the credibility of the personal attendant. On the strength of this testimony the Commission sent for Hermoso to appear again before them. First, they charged him with having been, in collusion with Gándara and the Jesuits, an author and leader of the conspiracy against the King and the State. He replied that this was absolutely false, and that there was not even a foundation for the charge, as the rising explained itself, being directed against the measures of Squillace, and the *alguacils* who had proceeded to carry them out so tactlessly. And as for his having conspired with Gándara and Villaflores, the former was not one of his friends, any more than Lopez, and the latter was not even known to him by sight. Then they told him that he had been seen mingling with the rioters and directing them. He replied saying that as a matter of fact he had been the whole time in the Court, and brought twelve persons of the Royal Household, all men of position, to testify that they had seen

him there. Thirdly, they told him that it had been proved against him by witnesses that on the Monday after the riot he had gone, in company with the Cardinal Patriarch, from Madrid to Aranjuez by the Bridge of Toledo, and had been able to pass both himself and the Cardinal through the insurgent guards, who had been overheard saying that it was Don Hermoso, one of their leaders, who of course must be allowed to pass.¹ To this his answer was that the witness had evidently not told the truth, as he went out by the Bridge of Segovia, and, though it was true that the Cardinal and himself had been allowed by the insurgents to pass, it was because he had given them money on behalf of the Cardinal. And he brought members of the Cardinal's household to corroborate him. Finally, the servant of Padre Lopez came forward again to say that he had made a mistake about the person, that he had never seen Hermoso before, and that it was the Abate Suarez whom he had mistaken for him. This, according to Gutierrez, is all that the papers contain with regard to Hermoso.

The Abate Gándara, being an ecclesiastic, was sent to be tried by his Ordinary, the Archbishop of Burgos, himself at that time a member of the Extraordinary Council, who, however, delegated another to examine him. In the summer of 1766, Aranda had issued an order that all ecclesiastics who held no appointment in Madrid should leave the city, and return to their dioceses. The first offence with which Gándara was charged was disregard of this order, but his reply was that he had acted on his Majesty's expressed permission, and even command, to remain at the Court. Next he was charged with being on terms of friendship with Padre Lopez, and this he freely admitted. Thirdly, he was charged with having, during the weeks preceding the Insurrection, received many suspicious visits from Padre Lopez, for whom he had regularly sent his own carriage, and that the manifest topic of their conferences was the plot against the King and the public tranquillity. To this he replied that not only was this charge of plotting quite unfounded and false, but that as a matter of fact the priest who paid him those regular visits was not Padre Lopez but the

¹ When the King fled by night after the riot to Aranjuez, the insurgents were indignant at what they took to be an indication that he did not mean to keep his word in regard to the terms extracted from him. Hence they watched all the exits from the city to prevent the Court from rejoining the King. This explains the third charge against Hermoso.

Augustinian Padre Ferrer, and that the reason of so many visits was the illness from which he was then suffering, Padre Ferrer being his doctor. And Padre Ferrer being called confirmed his statement. As they had nothing else to urge, the ecclesiastical judge reported that Gándara was an innocent man who had been aggrieved by an unjust prosecution. Under these circumstances it might have been expected that he would be restored to liberty, but, on the contrary, the Fiscals Campomanes and Moñino demanded his retention as a dangerous person, and likewise that he should be condemned to pay the costs of the prosecution. This was granted by the King on the advice of the Extraordinary Council, and the result was that the Abate was left to end his days in a rigorous and solitary confinement. Don Gutierrez observes that such an outrage would have been impossible, but for the dense secrecy in which the inquiry was shrouded, but points out how necessary it was for the interests of the Ministers of the Council. Ever since the arrest of Gándara in October, 1766, it had been told the King, and circulated among the people, that this man had been guilty of an attempt on the King's life. If, therefore, he were released now, the whole proceedings of the Council would be discredited, and perhaps the King, becoming suspicious of them, might take to himself other advisers.

Against the Marques de Villaflores they had still less to bring. He was charged with being a friend of the Jesuits, a frequent visitor to their rooms, and hence a plotter with them against the State. His answer was, that his friends among the Jesuits were their men of letters, and literature was the ordinary subject of their interviews. He was also charged with having been among the rioters, which he denied, and with having been the author of a satirical tract against the Government published shortly after the Insurrection, but this too he denied, and, according to Don Gutierrez, conclusively proved to be false. Nor was there more to bring against him.

After what they did in the Gándara case we cannot be surprised to hear that the Fiscals expressed no wish for the acquittal of Hermoso and Villaflores, but it is surely matter of astonishment that they should have asked that they should be condemned to death, after having been first put to the torture to ascertain their accomplices. That, indeed, seems to have been too much even for Aranda and his Council. Still, what they did was to condemn Villaflores to ten years' detention in a

fortress, which was afterwards commuted into an internment on his property at Granada. Hermoso's case they found more difficult to deal with, as he demanded not merely to be released but to have his character vindicated by a public statement of his innocence, signed, according to the terms of the ordinary law, by the two Fiscals. This demand, reasonable though it was, in the interests of their own reputation they were bound to refuse, so they sent him back to his prison with strict orders to say nothing to any one about the proceedings against him or his own answers.

Even if the prosecutions of these three men had been concluded before the date of the expulsion, which they were not, it can hardly be maintained that they contribute much towards justifying that measure; but let us see what other cases were relied upon. We know of but two only, of which let us take first that of Dr. Benito Navarro, which though in chronological order it comes last, takes precedence as being the one instance of a legal inquiry in which the Society was directly accused. Señor Ferrer del Rio has *more suo* a brief account, in which he says off-hand that the Jesuits were convicted by the testimony of many witnesses of having been the principal authors of the Insurrection of March, 1766, and of the attempt made in the following year. Señor Danvila gives a detailed summary of the proceedings in the case, taken from the official *Memoria*, signed by the Relator, Don José Maldonado, and published at Madrid by Joaquin Ibarra in 1768. It is from Señor Danvila therefore that we must borrow, leaving the reader to judge how far the facts fit in with Señor Ferrer del Rio's statement. Dr. Navarro was an advocate of some repute, who on October 28, 1766, laid before the Conde de Aranda a written denunciation of Don Juan Balanchan. In it he deposed that Balanchan had told him of his complicity in the Insurrection; that he had written letters warning certain persons to keep away from the places to be attacked, in composing which letters, that he might elude detection, he had imitated the style of the Marques de Villaflores; that he had bought the faggots of wood for burning the house of Señor Hermosilla; that he had taken part in the massacres in the Calle de Bordadores; that he had given seditious papers to some women to distribute; that he had written the Counter-Proclamation which was set up in the

place of the Proclamation that had been pulled down; that he had made a false deposition before Don Felipe Codallos in support of one in which Don Silvestro Palamares denounced Padre Isidro Lopez, saying of him that on the day of the Insurrection he (Padre Isidro) was to be seen at the door of the Jesuit College, surrounded by several others, all disguised, and engaged in starting the cry for the dismissal of Squillace, and the recall to office of the Marques de la Ensenada. In regard to this last point Navarro, in reply to a question by Don Codallos, deposed that Palamares was an anti-Jesuit, was not a man to be trusted, and was moved to make this charge against Padre Isidro, only in order that he might establish on his own behalf an *alibi* which would relieve him from the suspicion of having himself taken part in the Insurrection.

Aranda, on receiving this denunciation from Navarro, passed him on to Campomanes, who, on December 23, caused him to be arrested and confronted with Balanchan. What happened at this confrontation, or during the following month, Danvila does not tell us, but suddenly, on January 29, 1767, Navarro turned round, and declared that all his charges against Balanchan were false, and that it was the Jesuits who had put him up to make them. Padres Miguel de Benevente and Ignacio Gonzales, he said, had told him they believed Balanchan and Palamares had been denouncing their Fathers to the President, and he would be doing a charitable act if he would undermine their credibility by bringing an accusation against them. He resisted the suggestion in the first instance, feeling it to be an unlawful act, but they had assured him that, on the contrary, it would be highly meritorious; and, as his family had been from childhood upwards under Jesuit influence, and he himself had sucked in their teaching as it were like milk from the breast, he eventually succumbed to their seductions.

On hearing this the Fiscal was only too glad to drop the prosecution of Balanchan and institute one against Navarro himself, which, however, was held over till September 19th, 1767. Navarro then repeated his former confession, and also enlarged it. He declared that Padre Benevente himself must have been the author of the Counter-Proclamation, as was clear from various statements that he had made to him; that the Jesuit Fathers were the undoubted authors of the Insurrection, and likewise of an attempt to excite another on its first anniversary—to prepare for which they had spread the unfounded rumour

that decrees were about to be issued against the head-dress of the women and the whiskers of the men. The Court, as might be anticipated, accepted the case as made out against the Jesuits, but did not leave Navarro unpunished. They sentenced him to four years' imprisonment, and various disabilities to follow.

Inasmuch as Navarro's "confession" was not made till January 29th, 1767, the very day when the expulsion was decreed, it cannot, any more than the "convictions" of Gándara, Hermoso, and Villaflores, have counted among the motives for the expulsion, and yet it is made to do so in the *Memoria Ministerial*, which says the Jesuits "resorted to calumny and induced their agents to bear false-witness, laying what were really their own misdoings at the door of innocent persons." There can be no doubt that this passage refers to the Navarro case.

But, though too late to have been among the motives for the expulsion, was this man's final testimony that of truth? The passage quoted shows that the Council accepted it as such, but that does not decide the question, nor, we submit, do the circumstances point to such a conclusion. Why was he not confronted with the accused Fathers, and their depositions opposed to his? In the autumn of 1767 they were, indeed, far away, but the confrontation could have taken place during February, and no doubt would have been were it not for the resolution taken to put no Jesuit Father on his trial, or even to take from him a deposition of any kind. Nor are we told of other witnesses by whom this man's testimony was confirmed. All then depends on his personal character, and what is the value of that when we find, according to his own account, that up to the last moment he had been telling the grossest falsehoods, and reflect that he had a distinct motive for turning round, the times having become such that evidence favourable to the Jesuits would be most distasteful to the Court, but evidence against them most grateful. True, he was punished, as he deserved to be, but he may not have foreseen that, or may have felt that even so he would get off cheaper than by persisting in his original tale. To these considerations must be added, that the testimony of a contemporary writer is extant, according to which Navarro's behaviour before the Court was not his only misdemeanour. This contemporary writer is Padre Fernando Cevallos, a monk of the Order of San Geronimo, and a member of their community at Madrid, who wrote a *Memoria* on the Expulsion of the Jesuits, in which he gives some interesting side-lights on matters

that came within his cognizance. Of Navarro, when discussing his case, he tells us that some years previously he had been found guilty of alluring a girl-child (*una tierna señorita*) into a clandestine marriage with him, by the use of forged papers. Further, though Dr. Benito Navarro was no more worthy of credit as regards Balanchan than as regards the Jesuits, we learn from Señor Danvila that Balanchan had other accusers, and Padre Cevallos, who had been a personal witness of the Insurrection, tells us that this man, when arrested on Navarro's denunciation, had confessed to several acts of participation in the Insurrection, as that he had written and distributed satirical papers, that he had been among the rioters all day on Monday, that he had been one of those who called for the King to show himself to the people, and told the rioters to listen to him and not to a preacher. Palamares, too, who, it seems, was an apostate monk, was, according to Cevallos, among the rioters.

One further point must be noticed before we leave the Navarro case, for it reveals to us the kind of evidence on the faith of which the Council inferred that Padre Lopez and other Jesuits had been among the rioters, directing and encouraging them.

Next we come to the case of Don Juan de Salazar Calvete, the person of whom it is said in the *Memoria Ministerial* that he "was put to death for his insulting and threatening language against the King, having been excited thereto by the fanaticism of his Jesuit instructors." The *proceso* in this case, according to Danvila, is not at Simancas, but he gathers from the correspondence between Aranda and Roda enough to acquaint us with all that we need concerning it. Salazar was arrested at the end of May, 1766, and was tried before the *Alcalde de Corte*, D. Pedro Davila. He was convicted, says Aranda, of having used injurious expressions about the King; and the *Consulta* of November 30, 1767, explains more at length that he had gone about dressed as a woman, apparently during the Insurrection, declaring that they must not stop till the King's brains had been spilt on the ground. This, so far as we know from our authorities, was the sole instance in which the idea of regicide appears in the examinations, although, as we have seen, it figured so largely in the account of the conspiracy given by Carlos III. to d'Ossun.¹ By what evidence Salazar was convicted does not appear, but he was sentenced to undergo the

¹ See THE MONTH for July, p. 27.

torture to see if he had had accomplices, to have his tongue cut out, and then to be hanged. No names of accomplices were elicited by the torture, but the rest of the sentence was duly carried out on the 28th of June, 1766. If the man was guilty of the alleged offence his punishment was not unintelligible, or, according to the conceptions of those times, excessive, but in what way, it will be asked, were the Jesuits implicated in his crime? The *Memoria Ministerial* has told us. In his childhood Salazar had been at a Jesuit school, and he sent for two Jesuit Fathers, one being his old master, to hear his confession before his execution, and in an intercepted correspondence they bewailed his fate. That is all. And what does it come to? Voltaire, Diderot, and even Tanucci, who as we shall see presently, was the prime mover in the affair of the expulsion, had all been pupils of the Jesuits. Were the Fathers, then, responsible for all the anti-Christian sentiments and acts—including the persecution of the Society—with which the names of these men became afterwards associated?

These are all the prosecutions for the Madrid Insurrection of which our authorities know, as having been used to connect the Society with the crime; but we may class with them the banishment of Ensenada, which was ordered a few weeks after the event, namely, on the 18th of April, 1766. Nothing was published as to the reason of this banishment, and rumours were accordingly rife on the subject. Ferrer del Rio says it was generally believed that the millions of *reals* which circulated among the rioters had been provided by Ensenada, or rather given out by him, who in his turn had received them from the Jesuits. But at least there was no proof of this, as Lafuente—a hostile authority cited by Danvila—acknowledges. Besides which Danvila is able to give a letter from Roda to Ensenada, written at the time of the latter's banishment from Court, in which he assures him that the King, though compelled for good reasons to send him away from Court, had no cause of complaint against him, and retained the same high opinion of him as before. All which goes to show that the sole reason for Ensenada's banishment was that the people had asked for his return to office, and that he was known to be friendly with the Jesuits.

These are absolutely all the prosecutions recorded by our three authorities, which even in the remotest degree bear on the question of Jesuit complicity in the Insurrection. It

would be too absurd to ask if they sufficed to inculcate the whole Order and justify its suppression, but surely no one will claim that they amount to a solid suspicion, much less demonstration of guilt, against a single member of the Society. The utmost result in this direction which they yield is that one fanatical person who had used culpable language against the King, had in his childhood been at a Jesuit school, and one man of bad character brought a serious charge against two Jesuit Fathers, at a time when he had a strong personal motive for so doing. And, if it should be said that Navarro's testimony at least constituted a suspicion, why was it not followed up, and why were the incriminated Jesuits not examined? We have heard, indeed, the diplomatic reply to this last question, but it is too great a tax on our credulity to expect us to believe that they would have dispensed with a judicial inquiry in the case of Jesuits directly accused, had they foreseen the slightest chance of obtaining a conviction. Nor is it possible to fall back on the immunity of the Religious from prosecution in the secular courts; for, in the first place, there was the Court of the Nunciature; in the second, there was the leave recently obtained from the Holy See to override the immunity of the ecclesiastics in this particular investigation; and thirdly, there was the claim of the Spanish Sovereigns to regard treason as among the "privileged" offences, with which the secular courts were entitled to deal even when ecclesiastics were the offenders.

But let us come to the more indirect charge against the Society of having sought to excite public opinion against the Crown and the Ministers by inflammatory pamphlets, sermons, conversations, and correspondences. In view of the suddenness with which the expulsion was carried out, and the consequent completeness of the raid on whatever papers were to be found in the various houses, the Government had certainly excellent means of discovering any evidence of this kind which existed. It was likely enough, too, that they would find much which could be made to subserve their purpose. The Jesuits may have been, as we believe them to have been, absolutely innocent of the more serious offences imputed to them; but, as we have already granted, it was likely that they should feel sore at much that was being done by the Government, both in its general dealing with Church questions, and in its treatment of the Society in particular. And if they felt sore it was to be

expected that their sore feelings would find expression, not so much in public utterances—for our June article has shown to what a state of anxiety and even fright they were reduced—but at least in their private correspondence and conversations with trusted friends. There is a famous letter of Padre Calatayud's, dated September 18, 1765, and addressed to his Provincial, Padre Idiaquez, which illustrates this. He was distressed at the unrestrained publication in gazettes and pamphlets of the multitudinous calumnies against the Society, which had come in from Portugal and elsewhere, whilst there was the greatest difficulty in obtaining leave to publish any reply. "The times are perverse," he wrote, "and some of those who are about the Court are ill-disposed." What he desired was that Padre Idiaquez, on behalf of his Province, seconded by his brother, the Duque de Granada de Ega, and the Cardinal Archbishop of Seville, should present themselves before the King, and ask that his Majesty would in some way express his displeasure at the conduct of *El Mercurio*. No exception can be taken to this mode of action, but other Jesuits who felt as keenly may have been less prudent in their expressions, and these, when they fell into the hands of the Extraordinary Council, might have been twisted into matter of serious accusation.

What then did they find? To be accurate, we ought rather to ask what they found in the time precedent to the expulsion, since it is for the motives of the expulsion we are looking. If the question were thus to be limited, we are not aware what justification of the suspicions of the Council could be brought forward. But we may take the broader view, especially as the vindication of the good name of the Jesuits is of more importance than a criticism of the dispositions of their judges.

Even thus extended, the question is hard to answer. If, indeed, we must go by general statements, we should have to suppose that a great deal, and that of the most alarming and astonishing character, was found in the Jesuit houses. The King himself, writing to Tanucci on June 23rd, 1767,¹ speaks of "all that is being discovered daily in the papers that have been taken from their Colleges," and says that he has told Roda to send him the particulars. But we must judge of the value of these general accusations from the particular instances which we find alleged as typical specimens of the rest, and of these we can only find the following.

¹ Danvila, iii. p. 70.

On June 23rd, 1767, that is, on the same day as the King's letter just referred to, Roda obeyed the Royal orders, and gave Tanucci the desired particulars. But the only papers he can name as having been found in a Jesuit house are "certain *secret instructions* full of impiety, irreligion, and perverse politics." On July 21st Tanucci wrote back, thanking him, and saying that "he had already seen these *secret instructions* in other books, particularly in *I Lupi Smascherati*, which was attributed to Toggini."¹ On turning to *I Lupi Smascherati* we ascertain—as indeed the name intimated—that the *secret instructions* in question were the *Monita Secreta*, the well-known anti-Jesuit forgery. The Jesuit College had a copy in its well-stocked library, as has the house in which this article is written. What harm in that?

In the Rector's room of the Madrid College was found a copy of certain *Constitutions or Ordinances drawn up for the use of a new league which has been established to defend the King and the country and to put an end to oppression*. This was no doubt in itself a seditious pamphlet, and one that emanated from the leaders of the Madrid insurrection, for copies were circulated in the streets a few days before the outbreak. But the fact of its being in the Rector's room, "among the Forbidden Books," is sufficiently explained by its being, like the *Monita Secreta*, an historical document, a copy of which the College naturally wished to preserve; nor do Ferrer del Rio or Danvila refer to its discovery as at all compromising.

The *Consulta* of November 30, 1767, after speaking of the Salazar case, says his doctrine of Tyrannicide is defended in the *Answers to the Assertions* which Padre Adriano Croze translated at Vittoria, and which was found on the person of Padre Crispin Poyanos at Calatayud. The *Consulta* adds that an original manuscript on Tyrannicide, written by Padre Diego Rivera, Provost of the Professed House at Madrid, was found in that house. Here the *Answer to the Assertions* is the *Réponse aux Assertions*, that is, to the celebrated *Extraits des Assertions*, of which mention has been made in a former article. It is the chief of the replies by the French Jesuits to the charges of the Parliament. This work we can read for ourselves and see that the description given of it as defending Tyrannicide is untruthful, and doubtless, if we could see Padre Rivera's treatise,

¹ Danvila, iii. p. 78.

we should find that it is quite as incorrectly described by the *Consulta*.

This same *Consulta*, which is the most detailed of those emanating from the Extraordinary Council, also brings a general complaint against the Jesuits for translating and circulating answers to the attacks made upon them in the neighbouring countries. By so doing, it suggests, they were showing disrespect for the judges who had condemned them, and tending to bring royal and magisterial authority into contempt everywhere. It was a contention to some extent in keeping with the ideas of eighteenth century Absolutism, but in these days we lay more stress on a man's right to defend himself when accused.

As regards the other modes of utterance in which the Jesuits are alleged to have sinned, we find it laid to their charge (1) that "in their Missions at Barbastro (a town in the north-east of Spain) they had said that the sceptre would soon depart from the House of Bourbon;"¹ (2) that Padre Domingo Navarro, a Jesuit missionary in South America, had in an intercepted letter to his Provincial, Padre Vergara, dated June 3, 1767, "hoped that there might either be a change of King, or that Señor Cevallos might be sent back to Buenos Ayres as Captain-General;"² that at some date, not specified, Jesuit preachers at Murcia had spoken of a comet, then visible, as betokening the approaching death of the King; that elsewhere they had announced the near advent of Antichrist, and his descent from the House of Bourbon. These are nearly all, and typical of all, the definite instances of disloyal speech which the various reports of the Fiscals and decrees of the Extraordinary Council cite in substantiation of their sweeping charges. Without further details it is impossible to pronounce on their justice, and the two instances where we do get a bit of further detail serve only to increase our suspicions of the rest. Thus it appears from the *Consulta* of November 30th, 1767, that the remark about Antichrist coming from the House of Bourbon was made, not by a Jesuit, but by a secular priest who had come from the Philippines,³ made too in August, 1767, when the Jesuits were no longer in Spain. This man was a defender of the Jesuits, which was apparently the extent of

¹ *Consulta* of November 30.

² Letter of Bucareli, then Governor of Buenos Ayres, to the Conde de Aranda, dated September 6, 1767. Given by Señor Ferrer del Rio.

³ Danvila, iii. 65, 66.

their connexion with his remark about Antichrist. As for Padre Domingo Navarro's remark, of which we know only on the authority of an enemy like Bucareli, it was the simple truth that nothing short of what he stated would save the hitherto flourishing South American Missions, and the fact that he wrote it in a letter to such a saintly man as Padre Vergara¹ is a guarantee that there was nothing scandalous in the tone of the remark. We repeat it, however; we are not contending that no Jesuits made culpable remarks from the pulpit or in private channels of communication. We claim only that the few words, which were made matter of accusation against them shall not be accepted as such without evidence, which is not forthcoming, and still more that they shall not be taken, as they were taken, as incriminating the entire Order. In our June article we showed how earnestly and in how loyal a spirit Padre Idiaquez had laboured to check even the smallest imprudences in speech, and Theiner² gives a letter addressed to the Nuncio at Madrid by Cardinal Torregiani, the Pope's Secretary of State, in which letter the Cardinal tells us of the repeated exhortations in the same sense which had been sent to his Spanish subjects by Padre Ricci, the General of the Society.

Our readers have now some means of judging how far the Spanish expulsion can be taken as decisive proof of the guilt of the Society, but they may feel an outstanding difficulty, and say, if the Spanish Jesuits were so innocent and so untouched by the resârches of the Secret Inquiry, what inducement could a King like Carlos III. or his Ministers have had for their severe measures?

Let the answer be given in the words of Señor Danvila :

The question whether the Society of Jesus participated in the rising at Madrid has been sufficiently discussed to permit of a definitive judgment. From the commencement some individuals belonging to the Institute were recognized as intervening in the tumult, and were punished in consequence by the Padre Provincial Idiaquez;³ but

¹ See his Life in P. Peramas's *De vita et moribus sex virorum Paraguacorum*.

² *Histoire du Pontificat du Clement XIV.* Tableau, sect. xxx.

³ We insert this sentence, as it is part of the passage quoted, but Señor Danvila is here the victim of a clerical error. Padre Idiaquez was not Provincial of Toledo (in which Province lay Madrid) but of Castile, and the misconduct of one of his subjects which is referred to consisted not in taking part in the rising, but in publishing some months later, a translation of one of the French Apologies for the Society, without having obtained permission from the Royal Censors. (See MONTH for June, p. 641.)

this same Religious, who laid his vindication before the King and obtained a personal satisfaction, distinguished certainly between the fault and the responsibility of the entire body, and what was due to a few individuals for their personal acts. This also was the point of view discussed between Clement XIII. and Carlos III., and although the former denied (the general responsibility), the Extraordinary Council of the latter could not, either then or afterwards, present any decisive proof that the rising at Madrid in 1766 was instigated or directed by the Society. The foreign nationality of the King's Ministers, and their bold attempt to attack the national dress and popular customs, was quite sufficient to produce the tumult, and impartiality forces us to acknowledge that the Jesuits must have been pleased to witness it,¹ seeing that the foreigners who had excited the people's indignation had declared a war to the knife against the Jesuits and all that they represented in the world of ideas, since the accession of Carlos III. to the throne of Spain. The Jesuits, in the space of two centuries, aided by the protection of the Holy See, had extended their doctrine and its influence over the whole known world; education was in their hands, and with it the future of the youth of the country, the organization of the State, and even the conscience of the Kings. This network, which had been the characteristic of the ancient Spain, was incompatible with the Regalist absolutism of the Spanish monarchs, and still less with the reforming tendencies of the Encyclopædist Ministers of Carlos III. The shock was bound to come, and did come on the collision of the two powerful forces. This is why the motives assigned for the expulsion were drawn chiefly from the ideas, the politics, and the spirit of the Society of Jesus. This is why the Spanish monarch reserved the causes of the expulsion in his royal breast. This is why we hold that the sole cause which produced it was an essential change of royal policy, a true Reason of State, such as on some occasions covers grave acts of injustice—for it must always be a grave injustice to charge a religious society with having conspired against the fundamental institutions of its country, and yet not be able to point out in any way the object and plan of so dark a conspiracy.

This, we submit, is the true explanation of the fall of the Society not merely in Spain, but in Portugal, and to a large extent in France too; and the explanation likewise, as will be seen, of the general suppression by Clement XIV. Divided out as the rule of mankind has been by God between the spiritual and temporal powers, whilst the very best results have followed when these two powers have worked together in harmony, history has seen them more often in conflict as to the borderline of their respective territories. In these conflicts it is the

¹ This hardly follows, nor is there evidence that it was so.

fashion to represent the Church as always the usurper, the civil power as always the much-enduring victim constrained at last to vindicate its just rights. Still an opposite view is at least intelligible, and perhaps nearer the truth, though it would be an error to suppose that either of the two powers has been consistently in the right. We require, however, to notice chiefly, not the isolated cases of conflict, but the principles which each side embraced. By the eighteenth century the principles of those who exaggerated the rights of the Crown had become systematized, in which form they are known by the name of Regalism. Opposed to these were the principles maintained by the Holy See; and on each side there were not only statesmen to carry their system into practice, but lawyers and theologians to expound and champion it.

It was here that the Society of Jesus came in. By the law of her being she was—taking her as a whole—on the side of the Holy See. The direct rule, whether of states or churches, was never in her hands, but indirectly her influence was considerable, inasmuch as influential persons often used the spiritual advice of her confessors, or studied the works of her theologians, so many of whom were conspicuous for their advocacy of the Church's claims. Such was the character of the Society, as it existed in the second half of the eighteenth century; and, as at that time Regalist theories in their extreme form were tenaciously held by the Bourbon Sovereigns, who were prepared to enforce them with all the strength of their despotic power, and without much heed to the justice or injustice of their methods, it followed, by the logic of events, that the existence of the Jesuits should become critical. As Señor Danvila says, an old order in which the Church had been more or less free was passing away and a new one in which she was to be enslaved was coming in. A sharp encounter between the two forces was at hand, and the Society must be a chief sufferer from the shock.

It is with Spain that we are at present concerned, and there is plenty of evidence to show the extent to which Regalist principles prevailed in the Court of Carlos III. His Ministers were the more attracted to them, inasmuch as they were all more or less captivated by the opinions of Voltaire and his *confrères*, with whom, moreover, some of them were in regular correspondence. The King himself was unquestionably a devout Catholic, with a genuine reverence for the Holy See,

and a genuine anxiety to act in all respects conscientiously. But he had also infirmities of character which, notwithstanding his strength of will, caused him to become a nose of wax in the hands of his chosen advisers. He had the Bourbon incapacity to tolerate any exercise of power which was not under his own control, and this was admirable material for receiving the impression of Regalist notions. Moreover, his intelligence was not of a high order, as his letters show, and he was incapable of independent judgments. He leant on the judgments of others, on which account it was the more unfortunate that he realized so little the importance of hearing both sides. It is not only his ecclesiastical policy which illustrates these defects. They are equally visible in the misguided action which provoked the Madrid Insurrection. A Sovereign of real intelligence would have perceived at once the consequences likely to follow from entrusting the principal posts in his Ministry and his Household to foreign place-hunters. But the latter had their personal interests to serve, and plied him with sophistical arguments, which he was powerless to see through, and too stubborn to abandon until taught by the stern experience of insurrection.

Among the various advisers on whom he leant Tanucci was the leading spirit, and may be justly called his evil genius. This man was originally a Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of Pisa, and had rendered Carlos III. some service when he was as yet a young man, and establishing his sovereignty over the Neapolitan territory. It was this which first led to Tanucci's entering the King's service, and from that time he became his most trusted Minister and political educator. Carlos III. simply took over his political opinions from Tanucci, and as the latter was a pronounced Regalist, and even, to use a modern word, anti-clerical, the result was that, in spite of his piety, the King himself caught the contagion. Even before Don Carlos left Naples he had been thus led into measures adverse to the Holy See, and, as regards the Society of Jesus, although in his external acts he showed himself a friend, and was believed by it to be such, he was in reality, as some of his letters show, even then strongly prejudiced against them.

When Carlos III. passed to the throne of Spain, and abandoned that of Naples to his son Ferdinand, it was into Tanucci's hands that he left the guardianship of the latter's

youth. Still, Tanucci's influence over Don Carlos did not cease. The correspondence thence ensuing is most instructive, and it is one of the valuable features of Señor Danvila's book that it has incorporated so much of it. It may be said that through these letters Tanucci dictated the policy of the reign, and what was to be its ecclesiastical policy is revealed in the following extracts. On October 6, 1761, Richard Wall, then in office at Madrid, writes to Tanucci that the separation of what belonged to dogma from what was matter of money or jurisdiction, was the principle with which they must keep the Court of Rome under control. That meant to say that all ecclesiastical appointments, and the free disposal of all benefices, appertained to the Crown, and was outside the competence of the Holy See. This limitation of the Church's rights was sufficiently sweeping, but it was not sweeping enough for Tanucci, who wrote back, on October 13, that even Papal acts relating to dogma must be submitted to the King for his approval, as he is the head of the house. Consistently with this opinion of Tanucci's, Carlos III. issued a Pragmatic Sanction on November 20, forbidding the introduction of any Papal document into the country until it had first been submitted to the King for his approval and had obtained his *exequatur*. Then Tanucci, in a letter to the Duque de Losada, one of his party—who, as chamberlain, was in daily intercourse with Carlos III.—expressed his pleasure at what had been done, but added a warning that the Court of Rome must be constantly watched, as it was always striving to usurp jurisdiction and get money. On January 2, 1762, Wall writes back, that the King is much pleased to know that Tanucci approves of what he has done in issuing the Pragmatic and insisting on the *exequatur*, and then, on January 26, Tanucci replies by sounding a further note of anti-clericalism. "The influence of the Royal confessors," he says, "and especially of those who take a Fourth Vow to the Pope [*i.e.*, of the Jesuits], . . . have frustrated all useful projects, but have had the advantage of giving Spain a King who will make his reign remarkable by this (relating to the *exequatur*) and other useful measures for the good of the people."

Here is sufficient evidence that under the guidance of Tanucci, Carlos III. and his Ministers were set upon a campaign of anti-clericalism, in which the destruction, more or less complete, of the Society would hold a conspicuous

place. The correspondence between Madrid and Naples in 1766 reveals to us how they came gradually to realize that the Madrid Insurrection afforded a pretext for such a measure, too handy to be missed. As Danvila puts it:¹ "The correspondence of Tanucci with the Ministers of the King of Spain in 1766 is a mirror in which is reflected all that was thought or done in Madrid against the Jesuits, and no one can doubt but that the idea of the expulsion, the form in which it was carried out, even to the confiscation of all their goods, took birth in the brain of the Freethinker who, for the space of a quarter of a century, had conducted the political education of Carlos III." It is on the following facts that Señor Danvila relies for this judgment.

In the first instance Aranda, as we know from his Report of April 9th, 1766, had no thought of connecting the ecclesiastics with the Insurrection. This is the more important as his chief lieutenant, the *corregidor* of Madrid, had been able, in conducting his investigation into the causes of the rising, to secure the services of three of the leading rioters; and yet in the secret correspondence which this *corregidor* had with the Ministers, during the first six weeks after the rising, there is not a single suggestion adverse to the Jesuits or other clergy. But on May 6th Tanucci, who till then in his letters had merely inveighed against "the stupid populace," writes to the King "that the more he thinks of the ingratitude of the people, the more he is persuaded that it is due to bad education and the suggestions of the ecclesiastics." On May 13th, in a letter to Catanti, one of the Neapolitan envoys, he translates this conjecture into a categorical statement. "The ecclesiastics," he says, "and certain Ministers who were offended at the restrictions set by his Majesty on their robberies [he means Ensenada] had applied the spark to the popular fury." On May 20th he writes to the Principe de la Cattedolica, the Neapolitan Minister at Madrid, "that the populace would never be submissive and quiet until the King had begun to expurgate the friars, there being no doubt that it was their influence which had stimulated this sedition," and on June 20th, he writes again to Losada that "he is persuaded that the ecclesiastics were the secret authors of the disturbance." It is surely not mere coincidence that at this stage the Extraordinary Council issued its second *Consulta*, that of June 8th, in which nothing is as yet said of the Jesuits, but the

¹ Op. cit. iii. 16.

people are vaguely said to have been stirred up by the ecclesiastics.

On July 1st Tanucci begins to speak more definitely about the Jesuits, and writes to another envoy, Centomani, that the anonymous satires against the King were evidently a Jesuit poison, and that "such a fact of itself alone should suffice to make a Sovereign expel the Jesuits from his dominions." On August 9th he writes to Azara, the Spanish agent at Rome, "that he is convinced the sedition originated with the ministers of the Church," and that "the King had a natural right to expel the Jesuits from his kingdom;" and on August 15th, again writing to Azara, he tells him that "the Jesuits are always the same, being everywhere seditious, hostile to monarchs and nationalities, public robbers, full of vices, and mostly atheists," and "he wonders why the King allows the College at Loyola still to stand." And yet that in making these confident imputations he has no ascertained facts to rest upon, is clear from his letter to Losada on August 29th, in which he tells him that "if they (the King and his Ministers) have not yet discovered the authors of the tumult they never will." None the less, on September 2nd he formally suggests the expulsion, whilst expressing his fears lest the King should find his Ministers without the needful courage to carry it out on the same grand scale as in Portugal and France. He did not realize, it seems, what apt pupils of his teachings he had got in the Ministers of Carlos III., whose Extraordinary Council on September 22nd, following out the lines of his suggestions, though, as we have seen, they had certainly not proved anything against the Society, were able to discern its impulse "working throughout all the branches of the vast and complicated episode."¹

Meanwhile, Tanucci still continued developing his malign suggestions to his docile correspondents. On October 14th, he writes to Losada that the purging of the country from the Jesuits should be thought out with much care as, "once resolved on, it should be carried out thoroughly, and at one and the same moment throughout the kingdom," whilst on December 9th he tells the King, through this same correspondent, that "his desire would be that the Jesuits should be cleared out of Madrid before the King returned thence, and be expelled from Spain altogether at the earliest date possible, . . . that their property should be confiscated and a sum of one hundred

¹ See *THE MONTH* for July, p. 30.

ducats given to each for his subsistence." And these were just the further details of the expulsion in which the *Consulta* of January 29, 1767, went beyond the indefinite *Consulta* of September 22, 1766.

Here then we may end our account of the Spanish Suppression, for the reader now knows how much evidence the King's Ministers had on which to convict the Jesuits of the imputed crimes, and knows also what motives, apart from a demonstration of guilt, they had for desiring the Suppression of the Society.

S. F. S.

*The Grounds of Loyalty.*¹

WE who have lived all our lives in a country of long-settled government might take our political institutions so much for a matter of course as not to seek any reasoned account which might be producible in their justification. To us they are apt to appear in the light of facts standing simply as facts on their own basis, with no philosophy underlying their structure. Now it is quite true that individuals, who are men not of speculations but of affairs, have no need to search into such questions as the grounds of loyalty; and yet the point is one in which intelligent minds ought to take an interest. It should be a satisfaction to them not only to be loyal towards lawful authority,—which is the main concern,—but also to know the reasons for their allegiance.

The actual origins of political powers are various, though their ultimate basis in the moral order is one. As a matter of fact, rarely is the rise into supreme authority, either by a single person or by a body of persons, wholly justifiable; and hence faults of origin have often to be corrected afterwards by common acceptance or by prescription, as happens also in the case of large properties accumulated by the successive generations of a family whose members do not always act honestly. The possible complications of our problem are many; to simplify it we will set them aside, not even considering the instance which St. Thomas, after Aristotle, takes as normal, namely, the elevation of a man to kingship through his position of elder and patriarch in a people who are of one blood.

In our desire for a clear illustration, apart from complexities, let us suppose that out of congested populations in Europe emigrants go forth to one centre until 50,000 persons find themselves together in a previously unoccupied land, which

¹ Paper read before the Liverpool Branch of the Catholic Truth Society, on June 3, 1902.

offers them all the means of a permanent abode. In these circumstances what is to be done? We will answer the question by a series of proposals, each needing to be rejected or amended, until we come to a workable plan.

(1) First, it is suggested that a people so free, starting at such an advanced stage of civilization, should sacrifice themselves to no general control; that individuals so enterprising should rely on private rights alone, and on private energy to defend them, perhaps with volunteered assistance from friends in greater emergencies. According to the etymological sense of the word this is *anarchy*, which means the absence of a ruling power. Experience, which goes beyond etymology, would tell as many of our emigrants as had their heads properly set upon their shoulders, that anarchy must bring in its train the evils usually associated with the word,—disturbance, confusion, violence, riot, oppression, and utter misery. So clearly do the consequences stand out to reason, that among ourselves a man who preaches anarchy, if he would gain any hearing, is obliged to say that he advocates it only with a view to preparing the way for some form of government; that he wants to pull down only as a preliminary to rebuilding, not with a view to perpetual ruin. Government in some shape assuredly there must be over every populous community, and a defective government is better than none at all.

(2) A second proposal is, therefore, substituted for the first. The existence of government being admitted, its necessity is now declared to be that of an inevitable evil, inasmuch as every restriction on private liberty is bad in itself. So let there be a government, it is said, but limit its power to the checking of disorders by preventing one individual from encroaching on the rights of another. Cynic philosophy, with its doctrine of the self-sufficiency of the individual, was a parent of this idea, which has since found many foster-fathers in those whose maxim it is to let private energies act unfettered in the freedom of their native goodness, which sometimes, but rarely fails. The rare failures, it is argued, while justifying a restraining force, never justify a stimulating, propelling force. In other words, it does not belong to the State positively to advance good institutions.

(3) Against this merely negative attitude of the political power, we must have an amendment, and give as the third scheme, that government shall have authority to urge forward

as well as to hold back its subjects ; to do good as well as to check evil. And as regards the fountain whence are derived these enlarged powers, it is asserted that individuals resign some of their previously held private rights and make them over to a common delegate. At once the difficulty against such an explanation rises up with sufficient obviousness, that whereas a Government needs to exercise control, both restrictive and propulsive, over the whole community at large, no individuals have in themselves, as individuals, an authority thus universal in its reach. With the rise of State authority something new comes into existence which was not found among private persons in their isolation. If, therefore, these may be said to constitute a government over their own heads, it cannot be by simple transfer of some powers before vested in themselves individually.

(4) Once more, then, an amendment is imperative. A government must be established with distinctively political powers which go beyond the individual range. Let such an authority, therefore, be set up on sound principles ; but in order to check abuses let its term be limited by the same popular vote which calls it into being ; it shall endure according to the determination of the people's pleasure, which any day can withdraw what it has conceded. Whenever a majority in the State votes for the cessation, the trust is at an end. This plan has the fatal defect of an overweening belief in the safety derivable from checks, and a blindness to the need of a mutual confidence between rulers and ruled. Where these place no generous reliance in one another either because they will not, or because so low are they that they cannot, a good estate is impossible. In this sense it is true that a people has the Government which it deserves. While a number of reasons contribute to account for the notorious fact that the Parliamentary system of England, when introduced into foreign countries, has not succeeded, one prominent reason is that our bold device which is signified by "the omnipotence of Parliament" has proved too much for our imitators abroad. Their timidity has found refuge in checks, not indeed without solid grounds for fear. Anyhow, in their parliaments the sense and the reality of ultimate responsibility for the good of the country in its emergencies have been lacking, and the force of the parliamentary constitution has been thereby lost. Hence we must insist on a trust being

reposed in Government beyond the caprices of a popular vote. Absolutely unconditional stability may be too much to ask ; but at least a political system needs so much of indestructibility that only as the extremest measure can it be lawfully upset. We must not have revolutions on the South American scale of frequency.

From the above series of proposals, rejections, and amendments we have reached the conclusions that there must be a political power to prevent evil and to promote good within its own sphere, exercising for the purpose rights beyond those of the individual, and being stable in its appointment.

It remains for us to examine more fully how it is that a body of emigrants can raise up over themselves a government thus described, with authority greater than that of any member of the constituent body. This question concerning the popular establishment of political power is not easy ; nor are all theologians agreed on the point. One point is clear : what gives to the vote of the people a force to bind consciences, is that in the absence of any natural designation they must designate a ruler for themselves as a condition of orderly life in common. Society needs the appointment, and thereupon God, the Author of society, wills that it should be made ; it is His commandment. So far the authority is from Him. But does He directly bestow it, while the voters merely mark out the person upon whom His grant is to fall ? Suarez at least thinks not ; his opinion is that the people, while choosing the person, also confer the power, even though the latter existed before in no individual among the whole assemblage of electors. Accordingly he imagines a sort of contract to take place. But the complexity of his idea is more than we need go into at present ; it is enough for us to know that a widely recognized theory is that political power, at least in a case like that of our supposed settlers in an unclaimed territory, is immediately from the subjects and but mediately from God, and from the subjects acting not singly but collectively.

There have been those who were not satisfied with the above degree of divinity ; and notable among them was our own James I. of England, so conspicuous for his championship of "the divine right of kings." Suarez, who as a Jesuit theologian might have been suspected of a tendency to outrun the truth in magnifying authority, attacked the British monarch in the *Defensio Fidei*, and disallowed his arguments from the example of the Kingdom of Israel. The Jewish theocracy is not the type

of ordinary kingship. Neither is that type found in the Papal sovereignty as a spiritual power over souls; for both these constitutions are from God in a peculiar way. By what right the Popes used to hold temporal States we will not here discuss; not all theologians agree on the point, but their controversy does not concern us at present. All that Suarez wanted to enforce in his polemic against James, was that the Jewish King and the Pope belonged to an exceptional order.

Still, as regards earthly kingship all theories, whether for example that of St. Thomas Aquinas or of Suarez, have as an essential point that the authority is in one sense divine. All uphold "the Divinity that doth hedge in a King." We wish to emphasize this fact in order to guard against a notion which has sometimes been fostered by reading examples of heroic fidelity to a lost cause, such as was displayed in our own country to the House of Stuart long after its deposition. The suspicion raised is that devotion to kings is a blind loyalty devoid of insight, something like the attachment of a dog to his master, an instinct rather than a matter of conscience—nay, even an instinct going against conscience. It is fancied that in every struggle between Cavaliers and Round Heads the former must be the men of heart, the latter the men of head. Hence, by way of opposition to such a fallacy, we insist upon the reasonable ground of allegiance to kings. At the same time we would on no account deny the emotional ground. We advocate no exclusively intellectual loyalty, for it will not stand the strain of severe trial. Mere intellect is very weak, as a force in things practically arduous. The affective side of loyalty needs cultivation; it is worth while to feed it from time to time on pageants, and on the report of Court News, such as it appears in the daily papers, working on the public imagination. Thus is kept alive our consciousness that a Court is always existent, even though we ourselves are never admitted within its precincts. Idle ceremonies are idle; but not all ceremonies are idle. Church ritual is useful in its due measure, and will assert itself against Puritan reaction in favour of bare walls and of unsung prayers, unceremonial movements, and long dry preachings.

If we may compare allegiance to the King with religion, then as religion demands not only faith but also charity or love, so allegiance requires, besides a reasonable recognition, a feeling of attachment to the bearer of authority. If the bearer is a single person, as King, then it is far easier to feel the attach-

ment; and from this aspect the kingly form of government has been styled the best; relatively, however, to different peoples, another form may be better, and all kinds of government are valid which serve the essential purposes of rule.

A not unfrequent difficulty in the way of allegiance is the fact that those whom their religion marks out as a minority in the State are liable, even when open persecution is over, to suffer a number of annoyances for conscience sake. Where grievances of this character clearly exist, it is commendable to seek a remedy for them by any fair means that are available. Under such painful circumstances we should bear in mind that, where the State is highly civilized, physical force has not that preponderance which it has in barbarous lands. We to-day, in our country, have great moral agencies at our command: we have the press and the platform; we have social intercourse; we have the influence of our conduct in face of the world. Our constitutional means of redress, though often ineffective at first, can do much by patient perseverance. The voice which calls long and persuasively for fair play may hope to be heard in the end.

The conclusion is that we should cheerfully render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, on the basis of natural ethics, which I have tried to describe, and to which I now desire to add the familiar words of divine revelation. The two Princes of the Apostles have spoken in the New Testament: "Be ye subject," says St. Peter, "to every creature for God's sake, whether to the king as excelling, or to governors as sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers and for the praise of the good. For so it is the will of God that doing well you may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men; as free, and not as making liberty a cloak for malice, but as the servants of God. Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the King."¹ St. Paul thus supports his great chief: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers; for there is no power but from God; and those that are, are ordained by God. Therefore he that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God. And they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation. For princes are not a terror to the good work but to the evil. Wilt thou, then, not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good and thou shalt have praise from the same. For he is God's minister to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, fear.

¹ 1 St. Peter ii. 13—18.

Wherefore be subject of necessity, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For therefore also you pay tribute. Tribute to whom tribute is due : custom to whom custom : fear to whom fear : honour to whom honour."¹ These passages of the New Testament are but the enlargement of the principle long before laid down in the Old Testament : "By Me princes rule and the mighty decree justice."²

Hereupon two questions may be asked of me : first, Why have I introduced such hackneyed quotations ? and second, Cannot these texts be applied to cover injustice and tyranny ? To the former query, I reply that I want the confirmation of Scripture for what I have argued from reason ; to the second query I say, misapplication is not the application I desire. For my own part I am here avoiding all applications because I want to be as far as possible from every matter controverted among Catholics, and to confine myself to those general principles which we should all agree in upholding. We are here to give and take among ourselves Catholic truth, for this is a branch of the Catholic Truth Society : and I trust that in all I have said I have not travelled beyond what is strictly our range ; and that those who have listened to me will understand me within my chosen limitations. So I shall stir no hornet's nest of political controversy by seeming to speak as a party man challenging attack from men of an opposite side.

J. R.

¹ Romans xiii. 1—8.

² Prov. viii. 15.

Coptism.

I.—THE EGYPTIAN CHURCH OF TO-DAY.

IT is only recently that British subjects have begun to take interest in what concerns the Copts, though Great Britain has been in Egypt for twenty years. The grandest book on our work and position in that country is admittedly Lord Milner's *England in Egypt*, but, unapproachable as it is, it has not touched the Copts except to dispose of them in a foot-note. Now that it has become apparent that the departure of the British, since the reconquest of the Sudan, has been postponed *sine die*, it is a hopeful sign that more attention is being paid to the question of the native Christians of the Nile. They are to be found everywhere, commencing in Lower Egypt and continuing even to Gedaref, the granary of the Sudan, and are not likely after so many vicissitudes to be stamped out. Mr. A. Butler's *Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt*, and several translations of the Coptic Liturgies, are among works, not all written since the bombardment of Alexandria, which have forced upon the notice of the public the existence of an ancient Church with a chequered history, now breathing freely after centuries of oppression.

There is such a mine of information to be found in regard to this body that it is not easy to write briefly on the subject. So far as the historical portion of this article is concerned, it may render unnecessary the use of foot-notes and tiresome repetitions, if the writer states once for all that his history has been derived mainly from United Coptic sources, and particularly from *L'Histoire de l'Eglise d'Alexandrie, par le R. P. Georges Macaire* (Cairo, 1894). If plagiarism without acknowledgment may be allowable, it may be suffered in cases where the present writer has been forced to use information already employed in a previous work written chiefly from a political point of view. Though an honest critic may differ

toto calo from the treatment which the general question has received in *The Story of the Church of Egypt*, no less than from the conclusions arrived at, it would be impossible for him to withhold his respectful appreciation of the work of a lady who has been led through highways and byways of literature to produce a book on a subject presenting so many difficult features. It is no small praise to her work that a book published last year by an English clergyman,¹ would, according to some of his critics, not have seen the light but for the previous work, of which it has, in its historical parts at least, been called an abridgment.

The greatest glory of the land of Egypt is that it was predestined from all eternity to be the asylum of the Redeemer, of His Blessed Mother and of St. Joseph, during the Herodian persecution. In spite of the trail of the blood-stained foot of many an invader, Coptic tradition still points out some of the spots where the Holy Family are believed to have rested. There is nothing to show that St. Mark was the first to bring to this land of predilection the glad tidings of the Gospel. We read in the Acts of the Apostles that Egyptians were among the first converts. But St. Mark's missions seem to have been decisive in planting Christianity at once in the valley of the Nile, and Egypt, as a country, was apparently the first prepared

¹ If some historical and other slips have occurred in *The Story of the Church of Egypt*, by E. L. Butcher (1897)—and it is impossible that the book should have been written without some mistakes—these have been copied too readily into *Christian Egypt* by the Rev. Montague Fowler (1901), but some further slips might have been avoided. Mr. Fowler states that the Khalifa was killed at Omdurman, instead of at Omdobrikat fourteen months later. There are mistakes indicating that he has been imperfectly informed as regards the Sacraments, one notable slip being that unfermented wine is used by the Copts in their Eucharist. The fact is that the dried grapes are pressed by the priest, or under his supervision, and left before the wine is bottled after fermentation has taken place. The existence of Purgatory is not denied, as stated at page 206, as the belief is indicated in the practice of praying for the dead, particularly at Whitsuntide, but the word itself is unknown among the Copts. The statement that the Copts hold that the soul after death continues in an intermediary state for forty days awaiting the Judgment, is not a tenet of their Church and does not represent the opinion of educated men. The causes of the final schism between East and West are not quite correctly given at page 86, and the statement that there had never been a formal separation between the English and Oriental Churches (the former having been admittedly "Roman," at least in the eleventh century) invites criticism. The strangulation of Cyril Lucar in the seventeenth century (p. 117) "at the instigation of the Jesuits," is given with no authority for the foot-note, and follows the statement in *The Story of the Church of Egypt*, not given first-hand or even examined, that the Jesuits contrived to secure Lucar's death-warrant.

to receive it. The adopted son of the Prince of the Apostles¹ seems to have been specially sent from Rome on the second occasion to establish the see of Alexandria, while both were in "Babylon" together, and all traditions have united in acclaiming St. Mark as the first occupant of the second see in Christendom. The Evangelist was martyred in the eighth year of Nero (A.D. 62), and before his death had consecrated as his successor, Annianus, his first convert.

No Church escaped less than the Egyptian the convulsions of the subsequent ages of Christianity, yet her Liturgies have come down to us pure and unpolluted, and probably with as little change as possible considering the ages through which they have passed.

Three Liturgies are in use in the Coptic Church, those of St. Basil, St. Gregory, and St. Cyril, the latter being an adapted translation from the Greek of the Liturgy called "of St. Mark." Probably they all came originally from the same source. The late Lord Bute's translation (1882) of the first-named, which is now used on all occasions except four in the year, is, the writer believes, the only one which would enable a traveller to follow the Coptic Mass of to-day, whether "National" or "Dependent"—the latter term being now used by the Monophysites to distinguish those who submit to the old dependency upon the Holy See. This Liturgy, which is of great beauty, contains of course, in common with other Liturgies of Eastern Christians, not now in communion with Rome, the usual acknowledgment of the special powers granted by our Lord to St. Peter, and an adherence to doctrines, some of which would seem almost to fall within the purview of the recent Royal Declaration.

In the Prayer of Oblation the priest says: "We pray and beseech Thy goodness, O Thou lover of men [pointing to the bread], cause Thy Face to shine upon this bread, and [pointing to the chalice], upon this cup which we have set upon this Thine holy Table; bless them, sanctify them, hallow and change them, that this bread may become indeed Thine own Holy Body, and the mingled wine and water, which is in this cup, may become indeed Thy own Honourable Blood; that they may be unto us all, help and healing, and health for our souls and our bodies and our spirits."

The invocation of our Lady at the censing of her picture is

¹ 1 St. Peter v. 13.

of great beauty. "Hail to thee, Mary, the fair dove which hath borne for us God the Word. We give thee salutation with the Angel Gabriel, saying, 'Hail, thou that art full of grace; the Lord is with thee.' . . . We pray thee remember us, O thou our faithful Advocate with our Lord Jesus Christ, that He may forgive us our sins."

Elsewhere in the Liturgy occur the words, "The censer of gold is the Virgin; her sweet cloud is our Saviour; she hath borne Him; He hath saved us; . . . thou art the censer of pure gold holding live coals of blessed fire." The dead are prayed for in the ancient words: "To those who have fallen on sleep do Thou give rest." And previously: "Be graciously pleased to give rest to all their souls in the bosom of our holy fathers Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. Feed them in a green pasture, beside the still waters, in the garden of delight, the place whence sore-heartedness and sighing have fled away, in the light of Thy saints."¹

Thus this forsaken and down-trodden body, with its magnificent Liturgies and ancient traditions, is (though for the most part separated from the centre of unity) a really living and breathing thing, surviving to the present day, when Great Britain has by some unexpected provision of Providence been called upon to control the destinies of Egypt. There is no doubt about it. Nor is it open to question that these Christians of the Nile were directly saved as a body only twenty years ago from what would have been decimation, not to use a stronger word, if it had not happened that the Arabist rebellion was then and there crushed by the strong action of the British Government, compelled, as it happened, to act without allies. What wonder if these Christians, shy and retiring as they are, look upon the British as their tutelary gods. A few years ago it could not have been said that the British stranger acknowledged the admiration or fully recognized the existence of the Coptic community. Time was on their side.

As regards the sacraments among the Copts, Baptism is administered by triple immersion as everybody knows. The confirmation chrism immediately succeeds Baptism; after the Confirmation the child is communicated with a drop of wine. Leavened bread is used, and the unbroken loaf given to the tourist *unconsecrated*, is the same bread used in the celebration of the Eucharist. These loaves are also given to the congre-

¹ The extracts are taken from Lord Bute's translation of the Liturgy of St. Basil.

gation during or after Mass, simply blessed, and represent the *Αγάπη* or *pain-béni* common in French churches.

In marriage the bride and bridegroom are crowned as in the Greek Church, in the case of a first religious ceremony, their heads being bound together at one point in the ritual. Before the marriage ceremony, the course is similar to that in vogue among the Muhammadans, only the festivities do not appear to continue generally for so many consecutive days. The bridegroom receives his friends in his apartments, the bride receives hers in her own.

It is an old-world recommendation and a good one that before you go to an entertainment you should put your invitation in your pocket. In cases of a marriage festivity an invitation is readily obtained in Cairo, and tourists should see that this is procured before they sally forth. Your dragoman will take you anywhere you like, even to a native Christian wedding. This does not always mean that you are heartily welcome. Amongst the upper classes, the Muhammadans suffer more than the Christians from the presence of unbidden guests of British and American nationality, personally conducted by their dragomans for a consideration. But in these times of merry-making, the Copts are not exempt from the presence of the well-intentioned tourist who has been led blindfold into a snare. The writer is well aware of a case, which caused remark among the Copts, where a party of ladies from an hotel in Cairo did not arrive till after the bride had retired for the night. Nevertheless, she came forth with Oriental grace and good-nature, to greet her uninvited guests. Fortunately there are now signs that the long-suffering Egyptian couples have commenced to put their foot down, and require an invitation card to be presented, or at least the names of their visitors to be announced. Among the humbler classes the difficulty is less readily disposed of.

The displays at Coptic weddings have been borrowed from and exaggerated by the Muhammadans. They are probably all of heathen origin.

In Egypt, as elsewhere, the troubles of the people do not always proceed from strangers, but largely from the dwellers within their tents. The demonstrations of the hired mourners, or, to express it more accurately, of the mourners who hire themselves on the occasion of a death, have often enough been described. The "singers" have held their own, and hitherto it

has been found impossible materially to abate the nuisance which makes day and night hideous in the case of death or of a funeral, whether Christian or Muhammadan.

Much kindness has been shown by ourselves and by various divisions of Christendom in dealing with these poor outcasts of Christianity as they have generally been called. Putting the religious question aside, the whole tone of civilization among the Copts has been raised by the Catholic and American missions. The native Christians themselves founded some years ago a society with a printing-press of its own and a journal, which is generally read among the educated Copts. It is an old story now, but against such an innovation the present "Orthodox" Coptic Patriarch protested, and a rival society was started, based on the best principles of Oriental conservatism—doing nothing. The feeling of the people was too strong for Cyril V.

As in Syria, so in Egypt. The teaching of the French *pensionnats* has influenced for good not only the Muhammadan but the native Christian communities. The *pensionnaires* are taught history and geography, and friendships are formed between native and European girls which do not always disappear in after-life when the native girls marry. The good seed is sown and not lost. The tendency is that the Eastern wife becomes more and more a companion to her husband.

The approaches towards intercommunion with the Copts on the part of those who do not think with Catholics, have generally if not always been made on the assumption that whatever the National Church was formerly she is not now Monophysite. This statement is frequently repeated by the Copts themselves, but the main point is not the Liturgy, which is Catholic, but the Catechism in use in Coptic schools. The writer is not aware whether the "authorized" Catechism is still taught, but at least it is certain that there has been no formal repudiation of Monophysitism on the part of the existing "National" Church. A heresy once engrafted on an ancient religion dies hard.

It is impossible in the brief compass of an article of this nature to notice little points where Coptism and Catholicism touch, but it would be a gratuitous omission if the Coptic rosary as now used were not mentioned. It is unlike anything used in the West, and contains 53 beads—12 Our Fathers, and 41 *Kyrie Eleysons*.

With an ancient Liturgy and the seven sacraments, there ought to be no difficulty of assimilation when Egypt and Rome are brought together, but the general question of re-union is a wide one, and entails a glance at the historical basis of the Egyptian Church. No attempt is made here to deal with the Abyssinian Church, which is practically Coptic. She receives her Abûna and her Bishops through the "Orthodox" Patriarch of Alexandria, who consecrates them.

II.—VICISSITUDES OF CATHOLICISM IN EGYPT.

In touching the question of the unification of Eastern Christians and its effect, it is impossible altogether to avoid controversial matter, as writers not of the Catholic communion have, no doubt unintentionally, too often darkened counsel. The Rev. M. Fowler, of whose work, *Christian Egypt*, something has been said at the foot of a previous page, has mentioned¹ that, "in the eighteenth century the R. C. missionaries established a Uniat Church in Egypt which was mainly recruited from among the Melchites (Greeks), but also included many of the Copts," and that "the Uniat Churches consisted of those who were permitted to follow *the doctrines* and ceremonies of their own native Church, on the condition that they rejected the jurisdiction of their own Patriarch and acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope of Rome." It may be sufficient to point out that in no case does the Uniate, though not forfeiting his own rites, retain his distinctive doctrines. The Catholic Church knows many rites and sundry variations in discipline, but only one faith committed to her keeping. Postulants from Eastern Churches are not received into her communion without accepting her doctrines in their entirety, to the exclusion of those which may be contrary to her teaching.

If we want to know more fully what the Protestant view of unification is, we need only consult a prominent authority of the Anglican hierarchy, who not very long ago took the public into his confidence.² His lordship states that

they [our fellow-Christians in Egypt] have constant and watchful enemies ever by them in the emissaries of the Church of Rome, who

¹ P. 129.

² "Egyptian Bishopric Fund." A letter from the Bishop of Salisbury which appeared in the *Times* of the 10th of March, 1899.

set up by the side of every native Eastern Church a shadowy semblance of itself in a Romanized body, drawn from its own members, whether Greek, Coptic, Armenian, or Syrian. These Romanized bodies are in communion with the Pope, but *they are not in practical communion with one another or with the Latin Church*, which is also erected as another body near them. This policy of the Church of Rome is little understood in this country, but it is understood by the English Bishops. . . . We desire, if possible, to see the two native Churches, the Greek and the Coptic, united.

It may seem to be a dangerous thing to differ from so learned a body as the bench of Bishops, but on this occasion, if the Bishop of Salisbury faithfully represents them, they are skating on thin ice.

The following observations by a layman, whose only claim to be heard is that he has taken advantage of somewhat exceptional opportunities of studying the question *in situ*, will, it is believed, be found correct. They are given entirely on his own responsibility.

'If by the Syrian Church is meant the Maronite, any layman who knows the East is aware, if he cares to think about it, that this venerable body, representing the friends and allies of European Crusaders in the middle ages, have been Catholics for centuries, retaining as a matter of course their own Liturgy and rites. Wrongly or rightly, it has continued to be the general policy of the Universal Church not to sweep away the language, Liturgy, or rites of Eastern Christians. This "policy," which the English Bishops understand, is carried so far in Egypt, that no Latin priest is allowed to press a Copt to join the Latin rite or to induct him into that rite when a United Coptic priest is available, unless the postulant certifies that, (a) he will remain a Monophysite, or (b) become a Moslem rather than join the Uniate Copts. Even then, should he insist on joining the Latin rite, the liberty is reserved to him to return, as a Uniate, whenever he pleases, to the rite to which he has been accustomed. "Orthodox Copts" are united by a Uniate Coptic priest, and are required to make a short profession of faith, of which later. All this may be policy on the part of "the emissaries of the Church of Rome," but it is sound common sense.

The statement italicized by the writer, that these shadowy "Romanized bodies" are, though in communion with the Pope (of Rome), not in practical communion with one another and

with the Latin Church, is, of course, a contradiction in terms, and (may we say so?) the reverse of the fact.

When the Liturgy of their own particular rite is available, members of Uniate bodies should generally frequent it on such days as they are bound to hear Mass. They assist, if they please, at other Catholic services, Latin or Uniate. The Syrians at Helouan may be seen any Sunday at the Italian church, though their own is almost within a stone's throw. So practical is the inter-communion between the United Churches and the Latin, that a Catholic of the Latin rite who might happen to be up the Nile in a spot where no Latin church existed, would be bound to attend the Mass of the United Coptic or other Uniate Church, on Sundays and Holidays of Obligation, if such a church were available. He is free in such a case to make his Communion with the Uniate body if he desires to do so. A similar rule obtains among United bodies and ourselves. At Luxor the Latin Mass and the Coptic Uniate "Koddass" were said alternately in 1898, and presumably are still so said, in the same church and at the same altar.

The writer well remembers that at Famagusta in Cyprus, where very recently there existed no Latin church, the Latins (if any) attended the United Syrian Mass on Sundays and holidays. The Greeks themselves would have directed you there if you had asked for the Catholic church.

A Latin Catholic of whatever nationality in danger of death (say) in Syria, would be bound in conscience, if no Latin priest were available, to send for a Uniate priest of whatever rite (whether Maronite, Nestorian Catholic, United Armenian, or Chaldean), and receive from him the last sacraments, administered in a language of which perhaps he did not understand a word.

So much for "practical communion."

The Latin Church "erected as another body near them" (the native Christians) is not a recent institution. It is now chiefly concerned with the French, Italians, and Austrians, and with our fellow-subjects, the Maltese, and also, especially up the Nile, with rescuing waifs and strays among Muhammadan children. No one who has seen the unostentatious Sudanese village at Ghesireh, just outside Cairo, where cheery and chubby-faced black children are brought up as Latin Christians, could fail to wish well to this formidable propaganda. After all, the worst that is done to them is that they are given a

Christian education. If boys, they are taught trades; if girls, they are prepared for service, under the supervision of European Sisters. Not so many years ago the inhabitants of this village would probably have been slaves themselves if not rescued. Now many of them are the offspring or descendants of slaves.

The devil is not necessarily so black as he is painted by the Anglican Bishops.

As regards the wish of the Anglican hierarchy to see the union of the "two native Churches, the Greek and the Coptic," it is necessary to place the position on a sound basis. There were, according to the preliminary report of the last census (1897), 53,479 Orthodox Christians, other than Copts (Greeks and Levantines), *i.e.*, 7.32 per cent. of the whole Christian population, in Egypt proper. The Egyptian families belonging to this body were barely recognizable. What would the Greeks of the Egypt of to-day say to being considered as forming a "native" Church? The religious strifes of centuries have so far died down in Egypt that members of the Greek Church, where there is no church of their own, now attend Coptic services, in which their clergy also take part, and Copts under similar circumstances attend Greek services.¹

His lordship further states that many Moslems in Egypt are descendants of Christians. It would be more correctly stated that most of the Moslems had Christian ancestors. Maqrizi, the Arab historian of the Copts, who wrote in the fifteenth century, tells us that in his time the greater part of the inhabitants were descended from the Christian children of the soil. "These Moslems," the Bishop considers, "may well wish to come back to their old religion, but they will not wish to become Greeks or Copts. Their only choice is between Romanism and Anglicanism." This appears to be a slip of the pen. What was their old religion? The Coptic, and in some cases the Greek. The Bishop's view entirely ignores the awakening, such as it is, of the Coptic Church and also the presence of the American Presbyterian Mission, dating from 1854. The latter body has done yeoman's service in the way of education and civilization, and has to a great extent succeeded in bringing young Moslems and Christians together. The

¹ See an article in the *Contemporary Review* for May, 1897, written by an "Orthodox" Copt, for whose intimate knowledge of the subjects of which he treats, many beside the writer can testify.

number of Coptic *Presbyterians* alone was reckoned in 1897 at 30,000.

If there were a movement afoot in Egypt tending towards Christianity, which unfortunately is not the case, the convertible Egyptian would most probably turn to the body which still uses the Liturgy to which so many of his ancestors were accustomed. There he would find a considerable portion of the Divine Office said in or immediately translated into his own vernacular. Or, if he did not elect for "Romanism," he would go to the Presbyterian body which has already done so much for the country. There is still standing-room in Egypt for another Bishop, and the case for the appointment of a Bishop of the Established Church of England to supervise his own flock was presumably strong enough without an appeal to the No-Popery passions of a section of the British people. The omission of all acknowledgment of the civilizing influences of another Reformed religion above referred to, invites comment which it is not for us to supply. With these remarks it may be hoped that all contentious matter may be dismissed.

It is a prime object to show in these pages that Catholicism has never ceased to be represented in Egypt, though during many troublous times the witness for the faith has been obscured.

The terms "Jacobite" and "Melchite" have long since died out in Egypt, but they are retained by Western authors, and in writing upon the Coptic question it is impossible to dispense with them. Briefly, the Jacobites were so named from a certain Bishop (Ya'qub) of the National Church, and Melchites from the word "Malik" (King), the same in Arabic as in Syriac, representing the adherents of the Church of the Byzantine Emperor—the King of the Rûm.

From the time of the preaching of St. Mark till the spread of Monophysitism and its condemnation by the Council of Chalcedon in 451, the Church in Egypt needed no apologist; if she does now. After Chalcedon, the Greeks and the Catholic Copts—that is, those who accepted the decision of the Council—formed one brotherhood united in communion with the Holy See. Thus was the witness continued till the time of the separation of East and West. But the Greek Church of old Egypt requires some definition. Maqrizi, the Arab historian, just quoted, writing eight centuries after the conquest of Egypt, stated, no doubt in good faith, that the Mussulmans on entering

Egypt found the country divided into two camps entirely opposed, not merely in religion but in race, the Monophysite body being composed exclusively of Copts, and the Melchite (Imperialists) entirely of Greeks. The truth is that among Jacobites and Melchites the distinction was not racial at all. It is a mistake to suppose that the Egyptians as a body separated from the unity of the Faith after the schism of Dioscorus, and that the Catholic Church then and there became purely Greek. Unless we accept the difficult theory that many of the Egyptians took Greek names, the earliest Patriarchs of Monophysitism seated at Alexandria were not generally Egyptian, as is shown by the fact that ten of them had unmistakably Greek names. Even George Parkabios, "the Mokawkas"—called the betrayer of his country—though probably born in Egypt, was not an Egyptian but a Greek. The contrary is asserted by Gibbon, who calls the Mokawkas an Egyptian, perhaps not uninfluenced by the fact that Muhammad some time before the conquest of the country by the Arabs [638—640] addressed him as "Prince of the Copts."

Long after the defection of Dioscorus, Monophysitism had made no appreciable headway in Upper Egypt. After the Council of Chalcedon, several Coptic Bishops of that region joined the Catholic Bishops of Lower Egypt in signing the condemnation of Timothy Œlurus, who, in 457, had been irregularly consecrated as Patriarch of Alexandria by two excommunicated Bishops. Others again presided at the consecration of the Catholic Patriarch, Timothy Salofaciolus, shortly afterwards. In 553, the district of Thebes alone had enough Catholic Bishops to spare three, whose names have come down to us, to assist at the Fifth Œcumenical Council.

A word about this Timothy Œlurus before we proceed further, though his history has previously been given in English more or less *in extenso*. He was a Monophysite and of Greek nationality, if his chroniclers have not belied him—a sensational person and not at all a pleasant one to come across on a dark night. He joined four or five deposed Bishops and a few monks, and kept his eye consistently upon "the main event." In more than one sense he had an ugly habit of blowing his own trumpet. After frequenting the cells of the cenobites, it was his wont to address those of the exterior through a hollow cane. The nocturnal visitor called the

externs by their names, assuring them that he was an angel sent from Heaven to exhort them to avoid communion with Proterius, the then Orthodox Patriarch, and to elect as a new Patriarch a holy man, one Timothy, recognizable by the signs which he gave them. It was this manner of prowling about the monasteries at night that earned for him the nickname of "the Cat." The subsequent story is not much to the taste of modern readers. Proterius was martyred at Alexandria by the populace on Good Friday, 457, in circumstances of great barbarity. Of all the horrors of these times when passions ran high, nothing was more terrible than the murder of St. Proterius, recalling in its details the action of savage tribes towards their bitterest foes. Thus was established the Monophysite Patriarchate of Alexandria. After the farce of his consecration, Timothy proclaimed a severance of all communion between the Church of Egypt and the Churches of Rome, Constantine, and Antioch. He consecrated his own Bishops and turned out the occupants of monasteries and religious houses, only to people them with his own adherents. It may be doubted whether the complicity of Timothy II. with the *actual* murder of St. Proterius has ever been established, but at least his proceedings led up to it. The statement that the populace were bribed to commit the murder of their *de facto* Patriarch may be true. History can afford to be generous, and perhaps a little bribery went a long way in times when the question of the unpopular Greek yoke came to the fore.

The diabolical murder of St. Proterius was, possibly, not entirely a religious crime. The Catholic Church represented the Byzantine yoke and the Monophysite a crude notion of independence, and it mattered not that the leader of the revolt, on this occasion, happened to be of Greek nationality like so many of his successors.

Shortly after this event began the emigration of the Egyptian Catholics, principally towards Rome, where they were welcomed by St. Leo, who allotted to the monks a vast monastery. It may be recollected that a similar emigration had taken place in the days of St. Athanasius, who had demanded and obtained the hospitality and protection of the Holy See.

After the entry of the Mussulmans in the seventh century, the Catholic Copts had still a sufficient number of Bishops, especially in Upper Egypt, to make their presence felt. Later on it was, under God's providence, thanks to the vigorous action

of the Bishops of the old Theban district that a sorry peace was averted in the year 750 between the two parties, which, if it had taken place, would have sacrificed the religious question to those who held Monophysite views.

What language did the Bishops and clergy of Upper Egypt use in the Divine Office, and what Liturgies did they employ? Clearly the Coptic language and the Liturgies in use to-day among the Copts, Greek settlers being then practically unknown in that part of the world.

It is beyond the scope of this article to follow step by step the vicissitudes of truth and error during the following centuries, but it was only natural that Egypt should be shaken by them. The schism of Photius was cut short about 886, after having troubled the Catholic Church and the Empire for thirty years. After this the Orthodox Eastern Churches remained for two centuries at least in communion with Rome. In 1054, Michael Cerularius renewed the days of strife. After the completion of the schism, some who were true to the old faith left Egypt, but a remnant of the Christians of the Nile continued to subsist, true to their allegiance to the Holy See, without Patriarch and without Bishops, awaiting the day when it should please God to re-unite the dispersed flock of St. Mark, and to re-establish the ancient Church in its grandeur as the second see in Christendom.

The formal separation between Catholics and the Alexandrine Patriarchate did not take place till the thirteenth century, the said Patriarchate having before this time become purely Byzantine.

Already, in 1237, the Jacobite Coptic Bishop of Jerusalem opened his eyes to the truth, and placed his submission to the Holy See in the hands of Brother Philip, Prior of the Dominicans. His diocese was of an enormous extent, including apparently Lybia and Ethiopia. From the year 1253 the Catholic Copts of Egypt received regularly the visits of the Franciscan monks of Mount Sion. It became evident, however, that this little tribe required more attention. With the object of supplying the want, the monks established a hospice at Alexandria in 1325. Later on, the contributions of the Venetians enabled the Fathers to support a priest at Old Cairo, who could at least preach Lent and reanimate the faithful people by religious succours. Finally, the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria, the Bishops, and the Coptic nation assembled at Cairo, sent a

deputation to the Council of Florence in 1440 charged with the duty of submitting to the Sovereign Pontiff the desire of the Egyptian Church for re-union. In answer, a solemn decree was signed in 1442 by Eugenius IV. which included the incorporation of the Egyptian Church. From this period till about the middle of the seventeenth century, the union between Alexandria and Rome cannot be said to have ceased to exist, however imperfectly maintained. When John XVI. ascended the throne of St. Mark in 1675, things changed for the worse. Without actually denying the union effected at Florence, he retrograded from the steps in which his ancestors had walked for two hundred years. Something had to be done. It was decided at Rome towards the end of the seventeenth century to found a Franciscan mission in Upper Egypt, and later to send the Jesuit Fathers to establish themselves at Cairo. Yet even at the end of the eighteenth century there were indigenous Catholic priests in Egypt—half educated, if you will, but still priests. During the first year of his pontificate, Clement XII. had conferred on the Copts, under certain obligations, the perpetual concession of the Monastery of St. Stephen, which, during the lifetime of St. Leo, had been placed at the service of the faithful Egyptians. In 1735, Clement had endeavoured to make his voice heard among the Coptic people, but died without seeing the realization of his heart's desire—the re-union of the Coptic Church, which had gradually drifted further and further from the centre of the faith.

After the general defection, the Catholic Church in Egypt continued under the charge of Vicars and Pro-Vicars Apostolic. The liturgical and other Coptic books printed in Rome in the eighteenth century gave a great stimulus to Coptic learning. In the last century Muhammad 'Ali seemed to be distinctly in favour of the re-union with Rome of the Coptic population, possibly influenced by his French leanings. In 1824, Leo XII. signed a decree for the restoration of a Catholic Patriarchate, but circumstances at the time made the idea impossible of realization. It has been reserved for those who have lived under the pontificate of Leo XIII. to witness this desirable consummation. First his Holiness sent the Jesuits to Cairo with a mission to found a Coptic Seminary. Some years afterwards the African Fathers of Lyons, animated by the spirit of St. Ignatius, were sent to occupy the Delta, where they have established schools and colleges. It was not till

recently that the decree of Leo XII. was put into execution by the present Pope. The 21st of July, 1899, beheld the enthronement of Monsignor Macarius as Patriarch of the Coptic Catholic Church, under the title of Cyril II.

The total Coptic population of Egypt (proper) was given in the preliminary report of the last census as 608,446. Of these, the overwhelming majority belong to what it is the custom to call the National (*i.e.*, the Monophysite) Church. About 30,000 are claimed, as stated elsewhere, by the American Presbyterian missions. The Catholic mission returns in 1898 gave the total for the year at 20,000 souls, including, of course, children; the district of faithful Thebes alone claiming 13,000.

No doubt since 1898 the Uniate population has increased, but, without the succours of Divine grace, very little is to be done towards reclaiming the mass of the Coptic population.

The process of induction is very simple. The postulant is conditionally baptized by a Uniate priest, at least in such cases as there is ground for doubt whether his previous baptism has been carefully administered—a doubt which is often justified up the Nile. He is required to make a short profession of faith, including an acknowledgment of the two natures of our Divine Lord and of the Pope's supremacy. A further profession of faith in Purgatory is considered necessary, although apparently, as stated previously in a foot-note, the Copts believe in its existence without having a word to express the idea.¹ The Pope of Rome is prayed for in the Mass, and the *Filioque* is added to the Creed.

Such is briefly the presentment of the case. It remains to be seen how far the movement towards re-union will succeed. The secret is wrapped up among many others in the hands of Divine Providence, and he would be a bold man who would venture to prophesy.

F. W. F.

¹ "On Whit Sunday prayers are offered for the dead in all the churches, and it is considered especially meritorious to feed the poor on that day." (*Archæological Journal*, Sept. 1897, referred to previously.)

*The Politics of the English Catholics during
the Reign of Queen Elizabeth.*

NO. VI.—AFTER THE ARMADA,

IF it were possible to characterize the political history of the English Catholics from the time of the Armada to the end of Elizabeth's reign in a single sentence, one might say summarily that it was the period when the old political forces which had previously kept the body in equilibrium were disintegrated, and replaced by a new internal discipline. The political power of King Philip II., as it had saved Elizabeth from Catholics, foreign and English, at the commencement of her reign, so it saved the Catholics from Elizabeth at a later stage. But for him Mary Stuart, with French aid from Scotland, would, more probably than not, have triumphed in 1560, and it was his resistance which subsequently prevented Elizabeth from stamping out Catholicism entirely in England, and from carrying the standard of the Reformation far and wide into France and the Netherlands. It was in his dominions that the English fugitives for religion found shelter, it was on the prestige of his arms, in the last resort, that they had based their hopes of being restored to their native land. The defeat of the Armada in 1588 very seriously impaired that prestige, but did not crush it, for various reasons, especially because events in France soon gave to his power on land an importance even greater than before.

But upon the 13th of July, 1593, King Henry IV. of France was received back into the Church, and his conversion gradually healed all the discords of France and made her once more a powerful Catholic nation. From that time Spain's position was radically changed, with respect to the world of Catholics. Her unique position as the only great Catholic power had passed away. There were thenceforward two great Catholic powers, which carried competition to excess. How

deeply this would affect the body of the English Catholic exiles, can easily be conjectured. Spain alone had hitherto supported and protected them, and, by consequence, the arbitrament of Spain had been more or less decisive in all their councils and all their quarrels. That state of things was now past, or passing away. The old unity of authority and interest was evidently destined to split up, and many ideals of the previous generation would have to be abandoned. How these changes worked out, we shall see in due course. It will not, I dare say, surprise my readers to find that the Hispaniolated ideas of the old party leaders were asserted with more and more of Spanish assurance as the moment drew near when they had to be abandoned for good.

When the news of the defeat of the Armada reached Allen and Persons (October 9, 1588) they were in Rome, and after a short period of indecision,¹ Persons set out for Spain.² There were many reasons which called him thither. He was to negotiate some delicate business for his Order with the King, and to plead for the Seminary of Rheims, which, especially after the assassination of the Duke of Guise (December 23, 1588), was in a perilous position. He doubtless carried messages from Allen on the prospects of the forcible restoration of Catholicism in England, but no record of them appears to exist. Persons discharged efficiently the offices committed to him,³ and procured not only the better payment of the grant for the Douay Seminary, but also funds for new Colleges in Spain, over which he himself presided for the next six or seven years.

Nevertheless, it was no small misfortune for the cause in general, that one, upon whose services it depended so much, should have continued to reside for so many years so far away from the people, whose ever growing ideas he ought to have been studying above all other matters. This is shown in the spirit with which he addressed himself to the great problem of the time, the succession to the English throne.

¹ *Spanish Calendar*, 1587—1603, p. 466.

² His letter of introduction to the King is dated November 6, 1588. *Register of Letters to Toledo*, Archives, S.J.

³ His interview with Philip is described by Father Sacchini, *Historia S.J.*, Pars Secunda, 1620, p. 455, § 168, and H. More, *Historia Provincia Anglicanae S.J.*, 1660, p. 156.

Elizabeth was now old, and could not be expected to live for many years. Yet she not only had no acknowledged heir, but with an obstinacy which amounted to little less than a monomania, she refused to have the difficulty solved, and took all attempts at solution as so many acts of treason. Much confusion and danger resulted from this irrational course of action, for the better the claim the less it might be urged, and the real power of deciding the succession was being left to Elizabeth's Ministers. This was seen without difficulty by politicians living out of England, and we cannot wonder that men like Persons should have been anxious to do all they could to arouse public attention to so dangerous a state of things, and to induce the English people to assert themselves, for it was his conviction that the majority in England, some for one reason, some for another, would have accepted a Catholic candidate, if he was well supported.

That this belief was illusory, a thought born of hope, not of observation, is no doubt true. But it is also true that there were some very specious reasons for such hopes, reasons which induced him to take a share, probably a leading share, in the publication of the celebrated book entitled, "*A Conference about the next succession to the Crown of England*," published by R. Doleman, 1594."¹

The aim of this treatise is, no doubt, to prepare the way for the assertion of the rights of the Infanta Isabel of Spain to the crown of England, and its merit is that it goes thoroughly into the question, that it is calm, stimulates thought, and endeavours to be impartial. In our less passionate age, the book may be read without offence, indeed with interest. But it was a very bold measure for that time to assert the democratic

¹ "These dayes after great toyle Pagett and I have gotten that booke printed 104 de titulo Regis Hispaniæ to England, ipsum scil. autographon by 62 [this should be 26=Verstegan] and corrected in every page, yea whole pages added with Parsons owne hande." W. Gifford to T. Throckmorton (copy, dated 25 June, 1595, for 1594), R.O. *Domestic*, cclii. No. 66. There is a very similar paper at the Vatican. (*Borghese*, 488 ab, fol. 339, a copy, no year nor signature.) The writer, who is evidently Gifford, tells the same story, adding that he had bribed the printer's boy to get him the MS., and that the printed sheets had been given to Verstegan the day before.

These statements, the general reliability of which seem incontestable, seem to agree with the admissions which Persons made from time to time about the authorship. He denied he was strictly speaking its author, and we now see that it was chiefly penned by Verstegan. He admitted that the book was one in which he had a share, a publication of his party, of which he used to speak as "ours." Tierney misses the point in his long note on this subject. (Vol. iii. pp. 31-35.)

principle that the people should discuss and pronounce upon the titles of the pretenders to the throne, and still to uphold the old and conservative principle that religion was a valid reason for excluding a candidate, who was otherwise eligible. It was certainly a most unwise, unfit, and impolitic publication for a Jesuit to have engaged in. It was a calm and deliberate assertion of the claims of the Church upon the State, not advanced as an abstract theory, but asserted as a right to be conceded at once. It was put forward without public sanction, at the moment when those old political forces were breaking up, upon which depended the execution of the plans that were proposed.

By the end of the next year, 1595, the balance of power on the Continent, in so far as it concerned the English Catholic party, was altogether changed. Henry IV. of France had been absolved by the Pope; La Sainte Ligue, with its grandiose ideas, had all but passed away. Spain no longer gave the tone and fashion to the Catholic world, but the rivalry between that country and France was leading to the development of new ideals. The old Spanish party—what with the mishaps to Spanish arms, the exhaustion of her treasury, the mistakes of her partizans—was unpopular. Cardinal Allen had passed away, as well as the Duke of Parma, and almost all the active members of the great house of Guise. Philip II. was on the verge of the grave. The chief forces which had kept the Catholics together were therefore dissolved, and we can but expect a period of trouble, before the power destined to govern them in future can assert itself.

It is admitted by common consent that the death of Cardinal Allen was nothing less than a calamity for the English Catholic cause. He was a man made, if one may say so, to rally a defeated people. Father Holt finely called him "our Moses,"¹ so efficacious and so saint-like a leader had he been to a banished people in a foreign land. Never frightened, vexed, or discouraged himself, he was a source of conciliation, hope, and high principle to all around him. His weak point was that (like many other Englishmen) he did not seem to realize the necessity of organization. So long as he succeeded in his own way, he did not appear to appreciate the need of doing more. The consequence was that, when he died, chaos ensued. There was neither a man nor a machinery to take his place.

¹ T. F. Knox, *Douay Diaries*, p. 379.

Without a doubt Father Persons was now the most remarkable personality on the English Catholic side. He even possessed some of the qualities which Allen lacked. He had, for instance, the gift of legislation, but unfortunately he was deficient in the power of persuading others to submit to his regulations. He was too often masterful, and he resented insubordination to an extent which seriously impaired his power of command, and led to his embroiling himself in those wretched contests of accusation and counter-accusation which have cast a gloom over this part of his career. In spite of all this the necessity of having a man of mark, around whom the Catholics might rally, was so great, that we cannot wonder at finding a negotiation set on foot, to get him made a Cardinal, as soon as the news went abroad that Allen was sick unto death.¹

Had this negotiation been successful, if Persons had been lifted above his Order, he would have become identified with the interests of the clergy at large. Such an arrangement would have been sure to produce some immediate good results. The troubles of the Appellant controversy, for instance, would have been avoided. But the problem how best to rule the English clergy would not have been solved. Our Church was, in fact, already sufficiently developed for a certain measure of self-government. No Cardinal living in Rome could possibly be as well in touch with his flock as the head of the English Church ought to have been. The refusal of Clement to make Persons a Cardinal (though his decision was perhaps determined by reasons of a quite different character)² was certainly a blessing. It led to the transference of the government of the English Church to England itself. Unfortunately, however, this change was not accomplished without some very painful conflicts.

To understand these troubles we must go back to the date of Allen's death, October 16, 1594, when the party, being left without a head, became the prey of irremediable discord. The chief source of disorder was Flanders. It was here that the majority of the poorer refugees had found shelter, and had been relieved by the charity of the King of Spain. But the

¹ Hugh Owen to Massi, Brussels, 20 November, 1594. (Naples, Archivio, fascio 1686.)

² There had so far been only one Jesuit Cardinal, and Clement was not a great favourer of the Order. Persons' poverty and connection with Spain would also have been great obstacles, as the French influence was then very powerful in Rome. The names of Drs. Owen Lewis and Thomas Stapleton were also mentioned as possible Cardinals. For a discussion of their chances, see T. F. Knox, *Douay Diaries*, p. ciii.

Spanish finances were grievously mismanaged, the promised pensions were irregularly paid at the best of times, and when the Spaniards began to take part in the religious wars of France, all grants of money ceased.

The unfortunate consequences of this stoppage can be better imagined than described. The nobler spirits bore their sufferings with fortitude,¹ but there were others among the exiles who took the opportunity of these troublous times to strengthen their factions. Morgan and Paget, whose rash, quarrelsome tempers had done Mary Stuart so much harm, now began their intrigues again with the worst consequences to the whole Catholic cause. They were especially loud in condemning the Jesuits, as being the instruments of Spanish policy, and were soon able to point to the publication of the luckless *Conference on the Succession*, as apparently confirming their accusations.

The climax to the disturbances was reached when Morgan brought a list of thirty-six charges against the Jesuit Father Holt, which were so serious as to necessitate an inquiry. Father Holt was triumphantly acquitted, but the opposition had shown its strength, and the war of words went on unabated.² Less is generally said about the troubles in Flanders than about those in England and Rome, to which we now pass, for the records of them are comparatively few and scattered. From what one sees, however, one is tempted to think that the Flemish "stirrs" were possibly worse than the others, at all events they fomented quarrels and complaints on every side.

The next centre of disorder which we have to notice, was strangely situated. It was in the centre of those imprisoned for their faith in England. Thirty or forty Catholics, mostly priests, had been confined in Wisbeach Castle, and were now divided into bitter factions over the question whether they should or should not attempt to imitate within their prison walls some of the strict observances of the cloister. The heat evolved in this contest was phenomenal. The Jesuit Father Weston, whom the disciplinarian majority elected as their Superior, was accused of aiming at absolute tyranny by the rest, to whom in turn the cold shoulder was given by their

¹ Their sufferings are recorded by themselves in the numerous begging letters to the Pope, the King of Spain, and other patrons, which abound in foreign archives. A description by a bitterly hostile pen will be found in *The Estate of the English Fugitives under the King of Spain, 1595* (reprinted in Sadler's *State Papers*).

² H. More, *Historia Provincia Anglicanae*, p. 269.

more fervent brethren in a way which could hardly help being found vexatious. It is the fact of the quarrel which here concerns us rather than the merits of the rival causes.¹ There existed in England itself a recognized centre of reaction against the Jesuits and their friends. It was here that Robert Fisher made his head-quarters, while preparing for his attack on the Fathers, and it was here that the Appeal of 1598 was organized, here that the second Appeal was dated.

The third source of trouble was the English College in Rome. Grave and strangely persistent had been the quarrels between the scholars and their Superiors, the Jesuit Fathers. Popes, Cardinals, and Bishops had tried in vain to discover the secret of these chronic disturbances, until Allen, with his capacity for English affairs, laid down the simple principle, *Detur Anglis Anglus* ("Give the Englishmen an English Rector"). It was vain to hope that one benevolent Italian would be able to control two or three score of fiery young Elizabethans, many of whom had proved their high spirits in the adventures they had undergone in breaking away from England. Allen's suggestion was acted upon, and good results ensued. But after his death his advice was neglected. Italian Fathers came back, and again the Romans were as puzzled as before to know how to account for the recrudescence of disturbances.²

Thus at the close of 1596 disturbances had broken out everywhere with fresh vigour. At Wisbeach they had been renewed by Fisher, in Flanders the Jesuit Superior had to defend himself against Morgan before Royal Commissioners, and in Rome the General was conjuring the Pope to free the Society from the care of the English College.³

¹ The merits of Father Weston will, in the long run, be decided by his autobiography, edited by Father J. Morris. (*Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*, vol. ii. 1875.) I have since found the concluding portions of this, which covers the Wisbeach episode. A more important document still for this period, is Weston's contemporary letter to Manare, Stonyhurst MSS. *Anglia*, ii. 34. The case for the other side is given in Bagshaw's *True Relation*, edited by T. G. Law, *Jesuits and Seculars in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, 1889.

² Later experience showed that national Rectors were essential for the good government of the Seminaries. But it was also necessary to have some Fathers of the country also, and the division of authority between these and the English led to various complications, some of which were described by me in *THE MONTH* for October, 1899, and in *St. Peter's Magazine*, July, 1899, p. 325.

³ A translation of Aquaviva's petition was quoted in *Persons' Briefe Apologie*, p. 55. The original is in the Vatican Archives, with an accompanying letter to Cardinal Toledo. (Borghese, iii. 448 a.)

Persons, who was all this time in Spain, now resolved to go to Rome, and see what he could do to calm these troubles. Setting out for Italy in November, 1596,¹ he reached Rome early in April, 1597, and treated with the scholars and the collegiate authorities, the Pope and the Cardinals, so sagaciously and yet so gently and moderately that he captivated all hearts.² What had been amiss in the College was remedied in a trice, and a new face was put upon the whole aspect of English Catholic affairs. Had he always acted with equal large-mindedness, he would undoubtedly both have deserved and won the purple. But while his long residence abroad had kept him in sympathy with the seminarists, it had allowed him to get out of touch with the clergy on the mission, with whom he would now have to deal in order to consolidate the peace.

Contrary to the opinion of most people, Persons had come to the conclusion that the creation of a Cardinal for England was not the best means of re-organizing the party. He did not doubt that, "if the nation had a Cardinal, such as one might picture, he would easily remedy the greatest part of all these complaints and differences. . . . But it seems that at present the English nation has no man, whose sufficiency for this dignity would satisfy the judgment and taste of all, and thus there appears to be less defect and inconvenience in having none, than an unfit one."³

So far Persons was undoubtedly right. The need of the day was to substitute organized self-government for paternal rule. The first scheme proposed for this purpose contemplated the appointment of an Archbishop and a Bishop, with sees *in partibus*, the latter to reside in England, the former to govern from Flanders.⁴

¹ A letter of commendation for him from King Philip is dated October 16, 1596. (Archives S.J.) But his farewell audience was on November 10. (Stonyhurst, *Anglia*, iii. 18.) The commendatory letter from the Benedictine Abbot of Valladolid was dated September 20. (A. Bellesheim, *Cardinal Allen*, p. 289.)

² The most striking testimony to Persons' success is perhaps that of Edward Bennet (Tierney-Dodd, vol. iii. p. lxx.), who had previously been one of the most turbulent in the College. (*Douay Diaries*, p. 386.)

³ Persons to the Spanish Ambassador, May 18, 1597. *Douay Diaries*, pp. ciii. 394.

⁴ Persons' scheme (described in his *Briefve Apologie*, p. 102) is printed by Tierney. (Tierney-Dodd, vol. iii. p. cxvii.) A similar document is in the Vatican Library. (Cod. 6,227, fol. 27.) It should be compared with Father Holt's scheme, *Douay Diaries*, p. 384. Schemes had also been proposed for the erection of Sodalities among the Secular Clergy in 1597. The earliest of these is perhaps that of the treacherous John Cecil in 1591.

Admirable as such a scheme might be in itself, there was always the danger that it "would have caused some great motion in England."¹ So, after consultation with some leading members of the English clergy, the first step was taken quietly, and a sacerdotal hierarchy was appointed in March, 1598, the full scope of which was far more comprehensive than it is usually represented to have been.

The main features of the new constitution were the following. The Cardinal Protector (Cajetan) made the Nuncio in Belgium Vice-Protector, with power to hear and settle all causes of conflicting rights and jurisdiction, as well in Flanders as in all England. It would seem that the headship of the new ecclesiastical economy was originally intended for him, though force of circumstances soon settled it upon the Superior in England. Those priests who had left college, but stayed on in Douay, Brussels, or Spain, remained under the jurisdiction of the President of Douay, the Nuncio at Brussels, or the Vice-Prefect of the English Jesuits in Spain, respectively. Those who returned to England passed under the power of an Archpriest. Arrangements were made for each of these Superiors to have Consultors, and a regular means of communication with Rome.²

This constitution may in a certain sense be said to have lasted for over eighty years, for it was not till 1685, in the milder times of King James II., that the place of sacerdotal Superiors could be permanently taken by Bishops. The attempt was made to do this in 1623 and 1625, when Queen Henrietta Maria seemed likely to be able to protect the Bishops to some extent. But the experiment did not prove a success. The name of Archpriest and Assistants, however, was then abandoned, their functions passing to the Dean and Chapter.³ Rightly or wrongly, Rome seemed to be convinced that until the persecution had diminished, episcopal government was not in practice the

¹ Persons, *Apologie*, p. 99 v. Garnet wrote from England, 8 October, 1597, that Father Weston, D. Ba. [? Dr. Barret], and Tyrwhit, think "there will be great difficulty." He himself thought it might be arranged, if the person elected received jurisdiction first, and then, after he had seen whether he could govern quietly, he might go abroad and be consecrated. Stonyhurst MSS. *Collectanea P.* fol. 548.

² Most of the letters constitutive of the new hierarchy (all dated March 7 or 8, 1598) are printed in *The Douay Diaries*, pp. 399-401, Tierney's *Dodd*, vol. viii. pp. cix.—cxxiv. and there are others remaining in MS. in the English College, Rome.

³ I am, of course, aware of the very grave exceptions which could be taken against their authority.

best for the English Catholics in general. Many papers remain in the Vatican archives to show that this matter was never forgotten at the Papal Court, and that Bishops were instituted as soon as the state of the kingdom seemed sufficiently safe to warrant their being sent.

To return to the fortunes of the new hierarchy. As there was no possibility of discussing the new constitution beforehand, it was only to be expected that its institution would be, to some extent at least, canvassed after its erection became known, and in point of fact some priests refused to accept it until Rome had been consulted anew. This led to the so-called "first Appeal." Two priests, William Bishop and Robert Charnock, were deputed by the non-contents to go to Rome to ask for explanations, and, indeed, to work for some radical changes if they found the opportunity.

Unfortunately two grave errors were made in the treatment dealt out to these two men. The first was that while in Rome they were treated like recalcitrant scholars, confined, for the most part, to their rooms, and finally sent away in disgrace. To this the deputies submitted with a far better grace than might have been expected. They found (I imagine) that they had quite mistaken the temper of the Roman Court, and that, far from being welcomed, their mission was genuinely disliked.

The second fault was made after this appeal was over. Blackwell demanded an apology from those who had originally delayed to accept him. This provoked renewed resistance, and in November, 1600, a fresh appeal was made to Rome and placed under the protection of the French Ambassador. Many and warm were the debates which ensued, and the proceedings lasted on into the year 1602, when they were ended by a Brief, dated October 5, which, while it finally confirmed the authority of the Archpriest, also favoured the Appellants in some matters of permanent importance. Three of their party were to be named Assistants, as soon as vacancies occurred, and from this beginning they gradually acquired very considerable influence over the Catholic body.

The revolution in the government of the English Catholic clergy was now complete. The seat of administration, instead of being in Rome, had been transferred to England. Instead of relying upon the aid of a Government for the pensions and other aids, by which its external authority was maintained, the Church was now more or less self-supporting. Instead of being

under the sole protection of Spain, it was now under the patronage of France as well as of Spain, and the rivalry between the two often brought advantages to the whole Catholic party. It was impossible that these alterations should have been made without some friction and some quarrelling over details, and it is notorious that there was a good deal of unedifying squabbling over many of the debated points. These recriminations do not belong to the broader aspects of history, with which alone we are here concerned. One or two points, however, have been so frequently discussed, that a passing comment on them will be requisite.

The first is the allegation that the Jesuits, through the Archpriest, endeavoured to dominate over the secular clergy.¹ If this charge is meant in sober earnest, it can only be met with laughter. The attempt would have been as insane and preposterous then as it would be now. If, however, the statement is only made as a rhetorical flourish, conveying no more than this, that Father Persons did not always display that refined respect which he should have for the secular clergy considered as an order, for their institutions, dignities, and traditions—then the substance of the charge would be true enough. Though, as Persons' *Memorial for the Reformation of England* shows, his ideal of an English Hierarchy was in the abstract very high and dignified, yet in practice he too frequently acted as though he still lived in the original "happy family" period of the English Mission, the most brilliant time of his life, when he had led the seculars in England and Allen had directed the Jesuits on the

¹ The Cardinal Protector, in the letters of institution, laid it down clearly that "the Fathers of the Society have no jurisdiction, nor pretend to have, over the clergy." At the same time the Archpriest was instructed "to obtain the opinion and advice of [the Superior of the Jesuits] in matters of greater moment" (*Curabit Archipresbyter in rebus maioribus iudicium quoque eius, consiliumque acquirere*). Considering the difficulty of getting Consultors of any sort, and the advantages which the Jesuit Superior possessed for acquiring information, this instruction was natural enough. It was also fitting not only to revoke the recommendation, but even to forbid the Archpriest to consult the Jesuit "on the affairs of his office" after the controversy had taken the course which it did. "Quod et iidem religiosi societatis verum esse atque expedire censuerunt," says the Pope, in the final brief of October, 1602. (Tierney-Dodd, vol. iii. p. clxxxii.)

The Protector's instructions are often quoted inaccurately. Dodd says the matters to be consulted were "the affairs of the clergy." (Tierney-Dodd, vol. iii. p. 51.) Lingard calls them "secret instructions to consult the Provincial of the Jesuits on all points of particular importance." (vol. ii. p. 640.) None of the terms here italicized are correct. The original duplicate of the instructions is preserved in the English College, Rome; they do not appear to have been printed in full. See THE MONTH, January, 1897, p. 51; T. G. Law, *Archpriest Controversy*, vol. ii. p. xvii.

Continent. For a passing moment of extreme strain and danger such an interchange of parts was magnificent, but it was a serious breach of good taste to act or speak as though that arrangement could have been normal. Father Persons, inadvertently no doubt, seems to have been guilty of this fault from time to time, and sometimes, for reasons just given, he treated his adversaries like schoolboys.

The second point upon which attention has been directed, is whether the black sheep among the Appellants could be said to colour the whole flock. Here again the main facts are clear. On the one hand the cause of the Appellants was stained by the publication of a number of scandalous books,¹ they allied themselves with the open enemies of the Catholic Faith,² and a few of their number had reputations which will not bear close inspection.³

On the other hand, the case of the Appellants considered in itself was undoubtedly sound and laudable. The right of recourse to Rome ought never to have been resisted, and the way in which they were treated by the Archpriest and his friends was such as to justify them in insisting on having their case brought before the higher authorities. The faults of individuals cannot be considered sufficient to outweigh these solid merits of the cause.

But above all things it is necessary to take a broad view of the whole episode, and not to lose oneself in making odious comparisons between men who deserve respect and attention. We must therefore look back over the entire subject, and compare the period that preceded with that which ensued, and

¹ Bagshaw's *True Relation of the faction begun at Wisbich*, reprinted by T. G. Law, 1889, is a sample of the scandal-loving spirit which characterized these publications. A full list of them will be found, *Ibid.* Introduction, p. cxxviii.

² Especially with Bancroft, Bishop of London. (Law, *Archpriest Controversy*, vol. i. pp. 205-244, and vol. ii. passim.) Bluet got leave to return to England in order to bring about the apprehension of Haydock, who had acted for the Archpriest in Rome. (Parry to Cecil, 17 December, 1602.)

³ Among the six delegates who represented their case, John Cecil was a disreputable adventurer and spy (*Dict. National Biography*, Supplement), and while all were obstinate fighters, Bluet and Bagshaw were completely mastered by their passionate animosity. Colleton, Mush and Champney, on the other hand, were acknowledged to have been thoroughly respectable clergymen, and to have had amiable qualities. This estimate of them is drawn chiefly from their own writings, and also from the *French Correspondence* at the Record Office for 1602, 1603, 1604. Of the other Appellants, the only notoriously objectionable character was William Watson, the "Quodlibet Maker," who, as we see from the *Archpriest Controversy*, played an important part in the second Appeal.

this will convince us that upon the whole, and despite some lamentable excesses, the time had been one of advance.

Looking at the whole we see, as has been explained above, that the old system of paternal government had passed away. A less striking but more lasting form of self-government had taken its place. The troubles had drawn interest to the state of the mission, and stimulated in various ways the determination or the confidence of the clergy.

Looking to the period immediately following, we notice that after the central government was established, the movement for internal organization steadily progressed in various parts of the community. The next decade or two bring us to the rise of the Anglo-Benedictines, to the organization of the Jesuits into a Province, to the development of numerous Congregations of religious women, in short, to a period of great religious activity, such as in the ordinary course could only result from a solid work already done in reforming the government of the whole body.

True, tares have been sown with the wheat, and they are destined to bear some very bitter fruits later on. But the wheat has taken good root in good soil, and will not fail to bring forth its hundred-fold in season.

J. H. POLLEN.

Our Popular Devotions.

VI.—THE SO-CALLED BRIDGETTINE ROSARY.

IF the strength of an ecclesiastical tradition is to be gauged only by the unanimity of the statements made concerning it or by the frequency of their repetition, the case for the authenticity of the Rosary attributed to St. Bridget must be accounted very strong indeed. In every authoritative work of modern date which deals with such subjects the same information is given—generally in almost identical terms. Thus the *Raccolta di Orazioni e pie Opere*, &c., which is an official publication of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, refers to the devotion now under discussion in these terms :

The chaplet called after St. Bridget, because she first devised it and propagated it, is recited in honour of the most holy Virgin Mary, in order to commemorate the sixty-three years which, as it is said, she lived upon this earth. It consists of six divisions, in each of which are said the *Our Father* once, the *Hail Mary* ten times, and the *Apostles' Creed* once. After these six divisions another *Our Father* is added to make up the number of her seven dolours, or seven joys ; and the *Hail Mary* is said three times to make up the number of her sixty-three years.

Hardly less authoritative are the semi-official works on Indulgences by Father Schneider, S.J.,¹ and Father Mocchegiani, O.S.F.,² both of them Consultors of the Congregation of Indulgences and both of them equipped with the formal approval of the same distinguished Congregation. They speak without a hint that the matter presents the least uncertainty or difficulty. "Very famous," says the latter and more recent author, "are the services rendered to religion by St. Bridget of Sweden, more particularly by her *Revelations*, which the Church has always

¹ *Rescripta Authentica S. Congregationis Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis preposita*. Ratisbon, 1885.

² *Collectio Indulgentiarum*. Quaracchi, 1897.

held in honour, by the Order of our Blessed Saviour, of which she was the foundress, and by the institution of the Rosary in memory of the sixty-three years which our Lady lived on earth;" whereupon Father Mocchegiani proceeds to discuss in considerable detail the nature of the Bridgettine Rosary and the Indulgences attached to it. The language of Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexikon* is perhaps not quite so absolute,¹ but the fact of St. Bridget's authorship is not questioned, while in such older works as the *Dizionario* of Moroni, the *Bibliotheca* of Ferraris, and even in a series of articles on-Rosary chaplets by the well-known Bollandist, Father Victor de Buck,² the matter is taken for granted.

Nevertheless, with the exception of an incident in the Life of the Swedish Saint which proves nothing, no attempt has ever been made to produce evidence for the conclusion so universally assumed. The incident in question only shows that St. Bridget used a string of prayer-beads, then commonly called a *paternoster*,³ which, considering the fact that a hundred years before her time the *paternosterers* or makers of such beads had already formed important craft-guilds in all the principal cities of Europe,⁴ is not so very surprising. That St. Bridget or any of her immediate followers used a rosary of sixty-three Hail Marys, or that she invented a new method of praying with beads, or that she obtained a special Indulgence from the Holy See for some devotion of this kind is absolutely unsupported by testimony of any sort. The question is not raised in the Lives of the Saint, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, nor in the Swedish biographies, and least of all in her own *Revelations*. It was a matter of astonishment, then, when in the excellent *Vie de S. Brigitte de Suède*, by the Comtesse de Flavigny, a work which stands out amongst its rivals by the fact that the learned authoress has thoroughly mastered the old Swedish language, and carefully studied all original and native sources, I met with such a passage as the following.

¹ Second Edition. Edited by Cardinal Hergenröther and F. Kaulen, s.v. "Rosenkranzkronen."

² These appeared in the *Précis Historiques* for 1870, p. 370.

³ The incident is recounted in the Life by Bertholdus, *AA.SS.* Oct. vol. iv. § 88, p. 514. St. Bridget is said to have cured a sick Norwegian lady in Rome by giving her some beads of her *paternoster* (*tradito sibi de proprio Pater pro tuitionis munusculo*).

⁴ See a paper by the present writer in the *Journal of the Society of Arts*, Feb. 21st, 1902.

Speaking of the pilgrimage undertaken by St. Bridget and her daughter to Amalfi at the close of 1369, Madame de Flavigny says :

On their way they would have recited a chaplet enriched with singular privileges by the Sovereign Pontiff, wherein an Indulgence of a hundred days was attached to each bead. The custom of counting the number of prayers upon balls (*boules*) or studs (*clous*) threaded on a string dates back to the primitive Church and remained widely diffused, but except in the Order of St. Dominic, in which according to their founder's example they continued to say one hundred and fifty *Aves* divided by fifteen *Paters*, and as many *Glorias*, the Rosary had been forgotten during the great plague [the Black Death]. Every one arranged the Rosary according to his own taste ; St. Bridget's arrangement consisted in saying sixty-three *Aves* in honour of the sixty-three years which tradition assigns for our Lady's mortal life, seven *Paters* to commemorate the seven sorrows and the seven joys of Mary, and, finally, seven *Credos* in place of the *Glorias* of the Rosary.¹

Although there are several expressions in this passage which could not fail to cause some misgiving,² I hoped that I had at last come upon the track of something like definite evidence, and I took the liberty of addressing a letter to Madame la Comtesse de Flavigny to ask if she could help me to find contemporary authority for this statement. She answered my queries most kindly, but the substance of the reply was disappointing. Madame de Flavigny could not recall any other ground for connecting this particular form of the Rosary with St. Bridget than the voice of modern "tradition," and although she promised most obligingly to search her note-books for any references bearing on the subject, the matter stands at the present moment exactly as it stood before. Within the Bridgettine Order itself the tradition seems equally vague, and nothing in the primitive Rule can be pointed to which lends any countenance to the theory commonly received.³

Under these circumstances I am led perforce to gather up

¹ *Sainte Brigitte de Suède*. Paris, 1892, p. 377.

² It is certain, for instance, that the *Glorias* of the ordinary Rosary were not introduced until centuries after St. Bridget's time.

³ Cf. besides the Latin text which may be found in Hörmann's *Opera Sanctæ Birgittæ*, the *Wadstena Kloster-Reglor*, edited by C. F. Lindström, in the *Samlingar utgifna af Sveriges Fornskrift-Sällskapet*, Stockholm, 1845 ; the various publications of G. E. Klemming and C. Silfverstolpe, and Aungier's *History of Syon Monastery*. The slender *Bullarium* of Celsius, the *Diarium Vastenense*, and an article on "S. Brigitte en hare Aflaten te Utrecht," in the *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* (vol. ix. p. 60) have none of them yielded any further information.

such scraps of information as may be possible regarding the so-called Bridgettine Indulgence and the past history of the Rosary of sixty-three Hail Marys. I lay the disconnected facts before the reader to serve rather as guide-posts for future inquiries than as an attempt to expound a clear and consistent theory. In the present state of our knowledge it may safely be asserted that only conjecture can bridge over the gaps.

The first document is a decree of the Congregation of Indulgences issued in 1714, specially valuable as containing what purports to be an extract from a brief of Pope Leo X. at the beginning of the sixteenth century. A copy of the original broadside may be found at the British Museum, but the text is also to be found in the *Decreta authentica* of Father Schneider.

INDULGENTIÆ ROSARIIS SEU CORONIS QUAS S. BIRGITTE VOCANT A
SUMMIS PONTIFICIBUS CONCESSÆ.

Leo Decimus Pontifex Maximus per literas suas incipientes—*Ex Clementi* datas 6 idus Julii 1515 concedit omnibus et singulis utriusque sexus Christifidelibus qui per et super Rosaria, seu coronas S. Birgittæ devote oraverint, pro qualibet Oratione Dominica centum dies, et totidem pro salutatione Angelica, et pro quolibet symbolo si dixerint vel recitaverint, etiam centum dies Indulgentiarum: necnon pro quolibet psalterio [id est Rosario, aut corona quindecim Decadum Beatæ Mariæ Virginis] super illis integre per eosdem Christifideles, per se ipsos, aut cum socio, vel familiari, qui eandem Indulgentiam consequatur, dicto vel recitato, septem annos et totidem quadragenas.

Then is recited the brief of the then reigning Pope Clement XI. (22nd September, 1714) giving a Plenary Indulgence to those who make a daily practice of reciting at least five decades.

DECRETUM.

Sac. Cong. Ind. et Sac. Rel. præposita die 26 Nov. 1714, censuit permitti posse impressionem presentis Summarii Indulg. concessarum coronis quas vocant S. Birgittæ, addita declaratione, quod omnes aliæ indulgentiæ quæ in præsentî Summarîo expresse non continentur, sunt aut Apocryphæ aut nullæ aut a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Clemente XI. revocata per supradictum Breve datum die 22 Sep. 1714.

Prohibet insuper eadem S. Cong. ne huiusmodi coronæ vendantur aut alteri commodentur, et si secus fiat declarat supradictas Indulg. cessare et nullius esse roboris vel momenti. Dat. die 4 Decembris, 1714.

D. CARD. PICUS, *Præfectus*.

Loco ✠ Sigilli

RAPHAEL COSMUS DE HIERONYMIS, *Secret.*

Romæ, Typis Reverendæ Cameræ Apostolicæ, 1714.

A study of this document, which it seemed desirable to give in the original, makes clear two important facts. First, supposing that we may assume the earlier brief of Leo X. to be correctly cited, the phrase *coronas S. Brigittæ* (chaplets of St. Bridget) was already in use as early as 1515. It would probably be rash without having before us the entire text of Leo X.'s brief,¹ now, as it seems, irrecoverably lost, to connect the word *rosaria* as well as *coronas* with the name of St. Bridget. Of course this may have been intended, but it is also quite possible that the author of the Brief intended to convey, that all who used either ordinary rosaries or chaplets of St. Bridget, should obtain a hundred days' Indulgence for each prayer said upon them. Secondly, we are confronted by the rather surprising fact, that so far as the quotation extends, there is nothing to suggest that the chaplets of St. Bridget were chaplets of sixty-three *Aves*; on the contrary, it is implied that the whole psalter, *i.e.*, fifteen decades, can conveniently be said upon such a bead-string. This seems less natural in the case of a rosary of six decades; but after all it is of course perfectly possible to count one hundred and fifty Hail Marys on a rosary of six or any other number of decades. In any case it is obvious that Leo X. intended the second Indulgence of seven years to be a favour granted especially for the completion of the psalter, and to be something added over and above what I may venture to call the distinctive Bridgettine Indulgence of one hundred days for each Hail Mary.

Our second document is a story which, but for the dearth of other information, one would probably have passed over contemptuously as of no value. Let us acknowledge that, even as it is, it is possibly quite worthless, but it is at the same time deserving of more consideration than some might be disposed to accord to a little devotional leaflet printed less than a hundred years ago. A portion of this insignificant Flemish tract is devoted to an historical account, so it is pretended, of "the origin of the Rosary which goes by the name of St. Bridget" (*Oorsprong des Roozenhoeynkens onder den naem van de H. Brigitta*). The statement is somewhat verbose; it will be sufficient here to supply a brief summary.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, says the writer, in the time of Henry VII., King of England, great political

¹ It is not to be found in the *Regesta Leonis X.*, edited by the late Cardinal Hergenröther.

disturbances took place in that country. The insurrection threatened to be of a very serious character, and the King believed it would be necessary, in order to put it down, to call in the aid of foreign princes, but he was persuaded by certain pious persons to have recourse first of all to the protection of Heaven. Henry, who was a God-fearing man, approved the advice, and bethought him of the nuns of the Order of our Saviour called Bridgettines, renowned throughout the kingdom and honoured especially by the King and Queen for the piety of the community settled in London. To this monastery the King went in person, to ask their very earnest prayers in the crisis which threatened the peace of the whole country; and the Religious, thus appealed to, besought God day and night,¹ especially through the recital of the Rosary, to bring these disturbances to a happy issue. Their prayer was granted, the menace of civil war was averted, and the rebels made their peace with the King. Henry saw the finger of God in what had happened; he gave all the credit to the prayers of the good nuns of St. Bridget, and in his gratitude asked them what favour he could confer upon them in return. They asked that the privilege might be obtained for them (*i.e.*, for the male members of the Order who acted as their chaplains), to bless rosary-beads and to enrich them with some special Indulgence. The appeal made by Henry to the Court of Rome in consequence of this request bore fruit, so the Flemish account goes on to tell us, in a Bull granted to him and to his successor by Pope Leo X., in 1515, which Bull, the writer adds, is still to be seen in the Convent of the Bridgettines at Cologne.

In spite of certain difficulties with which this story is beset, there are features in it which suggest that it should not be too peremptorily rejected as a pure fiction. It is an undoubted fact that the Bridgettine Monastery of Syon, which was sufficiently close to the capital to be fairly regarded as London, was one of the most famous religious houses in England at the beginning of the sixteenth century. It was, moreover, situated close beside the royal palace of Shene, and can hardly have failed to

¹ "Deze Religieuzen verbaesd over het ootmoedig verzoek van der koning, hebben niet alleen eenige dagen, maer ook menig vuldige nagten beantwoord an deze vraag, en hebben zoo vuerig gebeden aen hunnen Roozenkrans, dat, nae Korten tyd, de byzonderste hoofden van die wederspannige rebellen, in tecken der goddelyke verzoening, zich geworpen hebben voor de voeten van den koning," &c. The title of the whole tract is, *Kort Begryp der Aflaeten*, &c. The copy in the Museum was printed at Bruges in 1834.

be well known to the King, even apart from the fact that it was a royal foundation of Henry V., and at that date consequently not quite a century old. Again, Henry VII. was a pious Catholic,¹ and further he had had much to apprehend from the menace of insurrection at various epochs of his reign, though in the event all such attempts were frustrated and quelled without serious bloodshed. That a Bull was issued in favour of the "chaplets of St. Bridget" by Pope Leo X. in 1515, we have already learned, while the statement that the Bull in question was to be seen in the Bridgettine Monastery at Cologne shows clearly that the Flemish account must be of much older date than the insignificant little tract in which it is printed. The important establishment of the Bridgettines at Cologne was broken up early in the seventeenth century, and we can therefore hardly doubt that the narrative just cited cannot be much more than a hundred years later than the events it professes to describe. To this a curious circumstance must be added which as a coincidence is certainly remarkable. The earliest definite example of the recitation of that form of chaplet which is now called Bridgettine, and which is based upon the number of sixty-three years assigned for our Lady's mortal life, is to be traced to Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby, the mother of the same King, Henry VII., who is the subject of the Flemish tract. We owe our knowledge of the fact to Blessed John Fisher, the martyred Bishop of Rochester, and Cardinal, who acted as confessor to the Lady Margaret, and preached her memorial sermon.² In this *Mornyng Remembrance* (1509) in which Fisher gives a vivid sketch of the daily religious practices of his patroness, occurs the following passage:

¹ Despite the extortion and the other misdeeds laid to the charge of Henry VII., he was undoubtedly a man of religious instincts, and he made a very pious end. Fisher, who preached his funeral sermon, says of him—I modernize the spelling: "The cause of this love (on his death-bed) was the fast hope that he always had before in prayer. It is not unknown, the studious and desirous mind that he had unto prayer, which he procured of religious and secular churches throughout his realm. In all the churches of England daily his collect was said for him, besides that, divers years about Lent, he sent money to be distributed for ten thousand Masses peculiar to be said for him. Over this was in his realm no virtuous man that he might be credibly informed of, but he gave him a continual remembrance yearly to pray for him, some ten marks, some ten pounds, beside his yearly and daily alms unto the prisoners and the other poor and needy." (E.E.T.S., p. 272.)

² It is consequently, practically speaking, impossible that the writer of the Flemish tract can have known that Henry VII.'s mother was so devoted to the so-called Bridgettine Rosary. Fisher's sermon was a most rare publication even in England, and cannot be supposed to have been in the hands of the author of the Flemish original.

After dyner full truely she wolde goe her statyons to thre aulters dayly. Dayly her dyryges and commendacyons she wolde saye, and her even songs before souper, both of the day and of our Lady, beside many other prayers and psalters of Davyde throughtout the yeaere; and at nyghte before she wente to bedde she fayled not to resorte unto her chappelle, and there a large quarter of an houre to occupye her devocions. No mervayle, through all this long time her knelynge was to her paynful, and so paynful, that many times it caused in her backe payne and dysease. And yet nevertheless dayly, when she was in helthe, she fayled not to say the crowne of our Lady, which after the maner of Rome, conteyneth sixty and three Aves, and at every Ave to make a knelynge.¹

It will be noticed however that in this extract there is no mention of this form of Rosary as a Bridgettine institution, neither is there any reason to believe that the Countess Margaret was specially intimate with the Bridgettines of Syon.² On the other hand, it is distinctly said that the crown of sixty-three Hail Marys is a Roman practice, and this is also borne out by the terms in which Pope Leo X. when bestowing an Indulgence on the so-called *Corona Domini nostri*, invented by the Camaldolese hermit Michael, refers to the "Crown of the Blessed Virgin," which evidently at that date was quite familiar. He says, after describing the new pious practice:

In mentem venit quod in honorem Salvatoris et Domini nostri Jesu Christi, fideliumque devotionem cedere posset, si quemadmodum ex antiquissima valdeque communi institutione Christi fidelium in honorem beatissimæ Virginis secundum numerum annorum, quos vixisse in hoc mundo creditur, sexaginta tres Angelicas Salutationes, septem interpositis Dominicis Orationibus, devote dicere solent, quod orationis genus coronam Virginis appellant, ita in honorem D.N.J.C. pro commemoratione annorum quibus ipse in terris versatus est ex triginta tribus Orationibus Dominicis quinque interpositis Angelicis Salutationibus quas Dominicam Coronam dicere assuescant, etc.³

As the reader will perceive, Pope Leo X., in 1515, speaks of the *Corona* of our Lady of sixty-three Hail Marys as "a most ancient and extremely common devotion of the faithful," and contrasts it in this very point of antiquity with the newly-

¹ Fisher, *Mornyng Remembrance*, in *English Works* (Edit. Mayor, E.E.T.S.), p. 295.

² She left them a legacy of £4, the same sum which she bequeathed to many other religious houses. She had also mediated between the Convents of Syon and Spalding in 1490. See Cooper (C.H.), *Lady Margaret*, pp. 132, 239.

³ See *AA.SS. Octobris Auctarium*, p. 21.

devised *Corona* of our Lord of thirty-three Our Fathers. At the same time it is worth while to note that the Pope does not call the chaplet Bridgettine, and that he limits himself strictly to the word *corona*, not *rosarium*. That the latter point in particular is not merely accidental may be inferred from the following passage of a Dominican author occurring in the Preface of a work published in Paris in 1512, itself entitled the *Corona Nova Virginis Mariæ*:

Et quamvis multis viis honoretur, nunc aliqui faciunt rosarium ascribendo ei omnium florum dignitates, alii psalterium, cum laudum divinarum fuerit maxima simphonista, patuit in suo cantico tam excellenti *Magnificat*, alii tertiam partem psalterii, scilicet quinquaginta salutationes, alii coronam, ad denotandum quod ipsa sit imperatrix omnium imperiorum et regnorum celestium terrestrium et infernorum (Ps. 44 Astitit regina a dextris tuis in vestitu deaurato circumdata varietate); et quoniam vixit in hoc mundo sexaginta tribus annis, capiendum ultimum per synecdochen partem pro toto, quia modicum restat ab assumptione ad nativitatem, dicuntur sex *Pater noster* et in fine cuiuslibet *pater* decies *ave* et sic erunt 60 *ave*, deinde ad honorem trinitatis et trium hierarchiarum ter *pater* et ter *ave Maria*, et sic erunt novem *pater* et sexaginta tres *ave*. Et sic honorabitur trinitas et novem ordines angelorum, etc.¹

This insistence upon the word *corona* at the same epoch by Pope Leo in Rome, by Bishop Fisher in England, and by Father de Villa Probata, the Dominican, in Paris is certainly not accidental, and we find the same devotion and the same distinction of terms equally emphasized nearly a century later in a little English Rosary-book printed at Antwerp in 1600.

And for all their sakes he (the editor) hath also added hereunto the Corone of the same most sacred virgin, first instituted by the aforesaid religious father, St. Dominike [!] or by some of his folowers, and lately reduced into the like forme by the same author, and now first printed with the like pictures. For the better understanding of the name, use, and fruit whereof, it is to be noted that it is called the CORONE, or Crowne of our Ladie, because it contains so manie *Aves*, or salutations of the B. Virgin, as she is supposed to have lived yeares in this world, before she received her Crowne in heaven, which are three score and three, and it is divided into seven partes; everie part containing one *Pater noster* and tenne *Aves*, saving the last, which hath one *Pater noster* and only three *Aves*, with a *Crede* in the end. In the saying of which Corone, certain particular pointes of the singular

¹ Mauricius de Villa Probata, O.P., *In Coronam Novam Virginis Mariæ*. Paris: 1512, Sig. A. ii. r°.

privileges, virtues, and dignities of the same B. Virgin, grounded upon the testimonial of holy Scriptures, and auncient Fathers, are so accommodated to everie *Pater noster*, *Ave*, and *Crede* in historical order, from before her Conception unto her most glorious Coronation, that, as here well may be observed, in the first part are proposed those things to be meditated, that belong to the preparation made for her coming, before she was born. In the second, such as pertain to her birth and education. In the third, howe she cooperated with the B. Trinitee, in Christ's incarnation and nativite. In the fourth her participation with Him both in joyes and in afflictions, most part of His life in this worlde. In the fifth her singular compassion in the time of His Passion and death. In the sixth the rest of her life, with her death and assumption. And in the seventh and last part, her most glorious Coronation, and exaltation above all saints and angels, next to her Sonne above all created persons.¹

Doctor Thomas Worthington, one of the principal translators of the Douai Bible, was, there can be little doubt, the author of this Preface, which is signed in the English Edition of 1600 T.W.P. (*i.e.*, Thomas Worthington, Priest),² while the Latin Edition of the same date bears T.W.A. (*i.e.*, Thomas Worthington, Anglus) on the title-page and T.W.B. (!) (probably a misprint for P) at the end of the Preface. Whether, however, Worthington was the author of the body of the book is not quite clear. The Preface rather implies that it was written by some other than himself (*quidam sacerdos*) while a prisoner in the Tower of London, in 1584, and that he, as a friend of the author, had only discharged the functions of editor, seeing that the book had been copied and was being circulated in a very inaccurate form. The Preface of the Latin Edition is signed 8 kalendas Julii, 1599; and, strange to say, the approbation of Matthew, Archbishop of Mechlin, attached to both the English and the Latin copies of 1600, is dated 25 of January, 1599.

¹ *The Rosarie of our Ladie, otherwise called our Ladies Psalter*. Antwerp: Keerberg, 1600. Preface dated March 25, 1590, and signed T. W. P. I am constrained for want of space to omit a number of other testimonies to the wide prevalence of this same form of rosary—I mean the *corona* consisting of sixty-three *Aves*. Mention may be made in particular of the Spaniard, Juan de Rebello (*Rosario de la Sanctissima Virgen Maria*, Eboræ, 1601), of the Italian Capuchin, Alexis de Salo (*An Admirable Method*, &c., Douai, 1639), and of the German Jesuit, Father Coster (*Manualis Sodalitatis*, Cologne, 1596). References may be made also to a quotation in a previous article from a seventeenth century English booklet, which declares that "an usuall paire of beades" consists of six decades.

² Worthington's controversial work, *White dyed Black*, printed at Douai in 1615, is also signed T. W. P.

Following immediately upon the passage just quoted in Doctor Thomas Worthington's Preface, occurs the following words :

And because Christ's crowne and glories is above all, here is added also another godlie exercise called the *Corone of our Lorde* ; which albeit in dignitie is first and chiefest, yet here it is placed in order of the time in which it was instituted, by a certaine holie Heremite in monte Camaldulensi, in the yeare of our Lorde 1515, allowed and privileged with indulgences by Leo X. and others his successors. This crowne consisteth of thirtie and three *Pater nosters* (according to the number of yeares which our Saviour lived in this world) and foure *Aves* with one *Crede*, and so is divided into foure partes, each parte containing tenne *Pater nosters* and one *Ave*, saving the last, which hath but three *Pater nosters* and one *Ave*, with the *Crede* in the end. And to these prayers are likewise applied certaine articles or points of our Saviour's acts and sufferings, to be meditated in this order. In the first part of His coming into this world, &c. . . .

Finally, here is also added another brieve *Rosarie* of fifteen *Pater nosters*, with so manie *Aves* and one *Crede* in memorie of the seven principal sorowes and eight joyes of our B. Ladie. Which *Rosarie* who so ever saith dayly, shall in the space of a yeare recite so manie *Pater nosters* and *Aves* as our Saviour susteyned woundes for us in one day, as is sayd to be reveled to St. Brigit.

I have retained this description of two other forms of "corona" or "chaplet" to illustrate how St. Bridget's name comes occasionally to be introduced into this matter, and at the same time to show how unaccountable is the suppression of all allusion to her, in other contexts, if anything like a strong tradition existed that she was really the author of the "Crown of our Lady." It is a matter, of course, which only admits of negative evidence, but that negative evidence is very remarkable. Attention has already been called above to the complete dearth of any reference to a special form of Rosary in the Life, Revelations, or Rule of the Swedish Saint. Space is lacking for adequate treatment, but I cannot resist the temptation to point out two sources of information showing how entirely the early records of the Order of our Saviour are strangers to the idea of any special Bridgettine form of Rosary. The first is an elaborate sermon, or rather treatise, on the Indulgences of the Bridgettine Monastery of Syon, compiled in English by a certain Father Simon Wynter in the first half of the fifteenth century, and pre-

served to us in a manuscript of the Harleian Collection.¹ Although this discourse enters into the minutest details and speaks in particular of an Indulgence of four hundred days for an *Ave* said kneeling in the church of the Syon Monastery, there is nowhere any allusion to the Crown of our Lady or Psalter or Rosary.² Secondly, there is a well-known Rosary-book compiled by a certain Canon Lamsheym, printed at Mainz in 1495, and known as the *Libellus Perutilis*. This treats entirely of the normal or Dominican Rosary of five decades, and the author obviously follows in the footsteps of Alan de Rupe. Strange to say, the same book was afterwards re-edited in a Bridgettine monastery, considerable additions being made and notably many quotations being introduced from the writings of "our holy Mother St. Bridget." Still there is not the slightest suggestion contained in this revised edition that the Bridgettine Order cherished a method of their own of reciting the beads, devised by the Foundress herself. It seems inconceivable that the fact should not have been alluded to if it were really the case, the more so that the colophon tells us that it was "compiled, amended, corrected, and read publicly in the refectory in the presence of all the Fathers."³

How then has the name of St. Bridget come to be associated with the chaplet of sixty-three *Aves*? It is impossible to do more than offer a conjecture. In the present state of our knowledge certainty is out of the question. But I venture to make two suggestions, which though quite disconnected are not mutually exclusive. The first is that there may

¹ Harleian MS. 2,321. I have to thank Father P. Ryan, S.J., for kindly undertaking the labour of transcribing this long sermon.

² It is only fair, however, to call attention to two or three facts in connection with this same great Bridgettine Monastery of Syon, near Shene, which might be thought by some to favour an opposite conclusion. (1) We learn from the *Plumpton Correspondence* (p. 51) that in 1486 "my Lady of Syon" gave Edward Plumpton "a par of Jeneper beads *pardonet*" (i.e., indulgenced). (2) We hear of the "lady sauter" as a penance at Syon, and of the "bedes" used by the young brothers. (Aungier, p. 422.) (3) In a later list of Syon Indulgences there is the entry, "And also whomsoever sayth devoutely our Lady Psauter in the saide Monastery shall have ccccc dayes of pardonne." (Aungier, p. 422.) Lastly, a copy of M. Francisci's *Quodlibet* in the Bodleian Library (Selden, 4^o I. 1. Th.) contains a number of early manuscript notes of about 1520, all connected with the Rosary. One of these runs thus: "Here foloweth the perdon of the bedes of Syon; for every pater noster, ave maria and crede ccccc daies of pardon and so for the hole ladys sauter LXVII M yerres of pardon." (!)

³ The monastery referred to was that of "S. Marie May prope oppidum imperiale Nordlingense." This second edition of the book was published at Augsburg in 1517.

be some substratum of truth in the Flemish story concerning Henry VII. According to this theory the Bridgettine Fathers would have obtained the privilege of imparting a special Indulgence to beads, which Indulgence afterwards, through some confusion, became connected with a particular form of chaplet or Rosary.

The second suggestion seems, however, more probable, though, I repeat, it is not inconsistent with the first, but, on the contrary, would provide an explanation of the "confusion" just spoken of. To understand the point of the difficulty, the reader must be reminded that the Franciscan Order use for their private devotions and carry at their girdles a rosary of seventy-two beads, which is believed to date back to a revelation made by our Lady to a young friar of the Order in 1422. The seventy-two beads, upon which *Aves* are said, correspond to the seventy-two years which the Franciscan tradition, contrary to that now more prevalent, assigns for the period of our Lady's life on earth. This Franciscan rosary is strictly a *corona* or chaplet, and it was enriched with special Indulgences for members of the Order. The Franciscans with their Tertiaries were an extremely numerous and influential body, and Wadding expressly says that the Franciscan *corona* of seventy-two beads came into extensive use outside the Order. A difficulty, then, was bound to arise whenever the *corona* of our Lady was spoken of, as to which system was meant, that of sixty-three or seventy-two beads. The latter would naturally come to be known as the Franciscan *corona*. The former, as reposing on a tradition for which authority was sought in St. Bridget's *Revelations*, might not unnaturally be termed Bridgettine. There can be no question that St. Bridget did assign the term of sixty-three years for our Lady's life,¹ and that she was currently cited as favouring this computation. It seems, therefore, quite intelligible that the *corona* of sixty-three small beads should be called after the very popular Saint to whom this revelation was attributed.

It would be possible to bring together a great deal of

¹ The number sixty-three is arrived at through St. Bridget's definite assertion that our Lady lived fifteen years after the Ascension of our Lord, and through the fact that she is believed to have been fifteen years old at the time of His birth. Our Lady said to St. Bridget: "Ego postquam filius meus ascendit ad celos vixi per xv annos," &c. I take this from MS. Harl. 612, col. 610. This is an old Syon MS. copied at great expense for the Syon nuns from the authorized text then preserved at St. Bridget's own monastery in Sweden.

evidence to show that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the *corona* of our Lady was almost, if not quite, as commonly



CORONA OF OUR LADY ("BRIDGETTINE" ROSARY)

with amber beads, or rather discs, and silver and brass mountings, in the possession of Mrs. Allchin. The rosary was purchased from a curiosity-dealer in Switzerland. The Loreto medal and part of the mounting are almost certainly of later date than the rosary itself.

recited by the faithful as the Rosary properly so called.¹ A large proportion of extant seventeenth century bead chaplets

¹ The Indulgences of the sixteenth century generally speak of the *Rosarium aut Corona Beatissima Virginis*. These terms were not meant to be synonymous, as the context not unfrequently shows.

have six decades, and I have previously expressed my conviction in these pages that the little pendant of three small beads, now almost universally attached to all rosaries, has been ignorantly transferred from the six-decade *corona* (60+3) to the five-decade chaplet, where no meaning can be assigned to them. Through the kindness of a friend I am able to give an illustration of an extremely interesting amber rosary of the former type, the beads of which may possibly be mediæval, though part, if not all of the silver mounting, is of the seventeenth century or later. The oldest six-decade rosary with pendant that I have come across is figured on a tomb of the middle of the fifteenth century.¹ The disc form of beads shown in our illustration was also not uncommon in the middle ages.

Lastly, I may mention that M. Olier, the Founder of St. Sulpice, is proved from his writings unquestionably to have used a rosary of six decades,² and that the same may possibly be true of St. Francis of Sales.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ This is at Efferding, Ober Oesterreich, in the Spitalkirche, upon the tomb of Andrew Hörleinsperger and his wife, A.D. 1427. I only know this monument through the engraving in Karl Lind's *Kunsthistorischer Atlas*, Plate xxxix. No. 3.

² For a knowledge of this fact I am indebted to the great kindness of M. l'Abbé Boudinhon, of the Institut Catholique, and of M. l'Abbé Monier, of Saint Sulpice. The passage occurs in M. Olier's *Mémoires*, under the year 1642. He tells us how our Lady taught him to offer the first three decades of his *chapelet* for one set of intentions, and *les trois autres dizains* for quite a different set.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

Mr. Mallock's latest Gallopade.

MR. MALLOCK'S "Last Words" on the Bacon cipher in the July *Nineteenth Century* possess at least a certain psychological interest as a revelation of human infirmity. They have reminded us forcibly of Thackeray's mocking verse :

O vanity of vanities !
How curious the decrees of fate are !
How very weak the very wise !
How very small the very great are !

Even though Mr. Mallock may not be very wise or great in the sense of the satirist, his talents are undeniable, and we honestly believed him to possess that measure of good sense which prevents a man from being blind to his own ignorance, and from making his blunders worse by obstinately trying to justify them. Mr. Mallock, in defiance of the verdict of every typographical expert, unshaken by all Mrs. Gallup's historical absurdities, and disregarding the overwhelming evidence of fraud in connection with the Homer translation, occupies seventeen pages of the *Nineteenth Century* in the attempt to show that there is still some mystery underlying Mrs. Gallup's cipher type. Mr. Mallock forgets that what he has to make clear is not that there are anomalies and irregularities present in the typography of the Shakespeare folio, but that those same anomalies and irregularities are absent from the work of other printers of the same date. That is an aspect of the question which Mr. Mallock strangely ignores. In the meantime he has shown us that he is so ignorant of the technicalities of typography that he is incapable of distinguishing italic type from the script of an engraved copperplate,¹ that the intersection of the tails of "italic" *g*'s and *l*'s and *z*'s awakened no misgiving in his mind, and that the unanswerable difficulty caused by the "tied" or compound letters had never even occurred to him. It is obvious to us that when he first wrote he, like Mrs. Gallup, was ignorant of the very existence of such letters.

¹ See an article on "Lord Bacon's Cipher" in *THE MONTH* for February last.

In the present article Mr. Mallock plunges even deeper, and presents us with an enlarged reproduction of a worthless little edition of the *De Augmentis*, printed thirty years after Bacon's death. "See," he tells us, "how hard it is to discern these minute differences. Here is some italic which *must* be printed from two founts of type, because Bacon's argument requires two. Yet it is almost impossible to distinguish them." But no one but Mr. Mallock, and possibly Mrs. Gallup, would dream of supposing that there are really two founts of type. What has happened is obviously this, that the printer has made no attempt to reproduce Bacon's plates, but has simply set up the whole in ordinary italic, caring nothing for the fact that the whole point of Bacon's illustration is lost. No doubt Mr. Mallock supposes that the compositors of the seventeenth century were all accomplished Latin scholars, and were in the habit of following with zest the thread of the philosopher's argument as they set up a new edition of his works from the printed Latin page before them. At any rate this would be less of a miracle than that, while setting or distributing type with the rapidity which the work of a printing-office requires, they should be able to distinguish the minute peculiarities which Mr. Mallock is so puzzled over. Let us add that we have lying before us at the present moment an edition of Bacon's works, excellently printed at London in 1838, in which the *Epistola exterior* of the *De Augmentis* is set up in ordinary uniform Roman type without even the pretence of italics. We wonder if our opponent would maintain that there are two founts of type in it. If anything were wanting to complete the logical absurdity of Mr. Mallock's position, it would be the occurrence twice over in the cipher italic which he facsimiles of the triple combination *ffi*, the letters of which are all one character, but are supposed to belong to different founts. The only escape from the difficulty would be to suppose that the printer who brought out this waistcoat-pocket edition of the *De Augmentis* in 1661, provided himself with eight subtly differing forms of this one combination *ffi*, which his compositors recognized at a glance as they filled their composing-sticks, but which the degenerate experts of the present day cannot distinguish after months of patient study. We say that if there be anything in Mrs. Gallup's contention, this is the inexorable logical inference, and if Mr. Mallock will condescend to give his attention to the point he will, we believe, admit that it is so.

Suppressio Veri and Suggestio Falsi.

The *English Churchman* is a journal the notorious anti-Papalism of which, like that of *The Rock*, sufficiently dispenses us as a rule from taking note of its utterances. If we make an exception, it is to illustrate the inveterate incapacity for the truthful presentment of any religious topic whatever which is exhibited by the controversialists who contribute to its columns. Mr. Walter Walsh in particular, the author of the *Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, is never weary of inveighing against the dissimulation, the insincerity, the Jesuitical methods of Rome and Ritualism. It is interesting to note the example of straightforwardness which is set by Mr. Walter Walsh himself.

In an article which appears in the *English Churchman* for July 10th, under the heading of "Protestant Notes" this contributor supplies his readers with some interesting information about the late Lord Acton. The tone of certain articles in *The Tablet* has made it clear to Mr. Walsh that "Rome never really forgives a man who, being one of her children, has had the courage to criticize her line of conduct." "In the fifty-sixth of his *Letters from Rome on the Council*," the writer goes on to say, "the late Lord Acton gave a list of forty-two Articles which became matters of faith when the Pope was declared infallible." Mr. Walsh gives several examples of these Articles, but as we have no intention of re-opening here a discussion upon the Articles themselves, long ago dealt with by Cardinal Hergenröther and others, we are content to quote only his first example by way of specimen. "Art. xiii. All clerics are wholly exempt by Divine right from all civil jurisdiction, and therefore not bound in conscience by civil law." Now what interests us at the present moment is not the matter of these Articles, which we may meet in almost every case by a flat denial that such teaching is or was at any time regarded as "matter of faith," but Mr. Walsh's manner of introducing the subject to his readers, happy to accept as Gospel truth whatever he may choose to lay before them.

The *Letters from Rome on the Council* are those which appeared originally in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, in 1870, under the name of Quirinus; and first we may remark how Mr. Walsh, without any hesitation, or warning, or qualification, suppresses

the fact of their anonymity, and informs us that his citations are taken from the 56th of "Lord Acton's letters from Rome." No doubt it is highly probable that Lord Acton was associated with this series of letters, but he never, we understand, acknowledged them unequivocally as his own. On the contrary, the Preface of the completed English translation, dated September, 1870, states distinctly, that three different writers contributed to the series. Still more, the text of Letter 56 informs us that the list of forty-two articles referred to by Mr. Walsh, was compiled by "a German theologian." Thus even though it were shown, which is not the case, that Lord Acton was the writer of this letter, he in no way made himself responsible for the accuracy of the historical statements involved in it.

But what is a much more serious misrepresentation, the *English Churchman* implies that this list of extravagant propositions was drawn up by Lord Acton after the definition of Infallibility, and that they embodied doctrines which were recognized as having already become part of the teaching of the Church, and matters of faith. Mr. Walsh makes no scruple of leaving his readers under the impression that these propositions were swallowed without protest by all good Ultramontanes along with the dogma of Papal Infallibility. In point of fact, they represented only a desperate effort to stave off the definition, by urging that it involved the acceptance of propositions which no man in his senses could agree to. The attempt was indeed a desperate one, and it has long been admitted by all Catholic theologians, that no such consequences are involved by the terms of the Vatican decree as it was finally adopted and promulgated.

This much at least is clear, that if Lord Acton at any time believed that an approval of all these articles was necessarily bound up with the doctrine of Infallibility, he must either have found out his mistake, or he must have reconciled his conscience to accepting them. "He died," says Mr. Walsh, "at peace with the Church of Rome." This, like his attendance at Sunday Mass, was a public fact about which there was no disguise. But as regards his connection with the *Letters from the Council*, it was not seemingly Lord Acton's wish to take the world into his confidence. Neither the British Museum Catalogue nor the standard authorities on literary pseudonyms, such as Cushing, or Halkett and Lang, seem to share Mr. Walsh's clear perception of the identity of "Quirinus."

Reviews.

I.—THREE LIVES OF FÉNELON.¹

THE memory of Fénelon, like that of other great men of not quite the first rank, has suffered from the indiscriminating eulogies of his admirers. A reaction was inevitable, and it was equally inevitable that the réaction should go too far, as in fact it seems to have done in the writings of M. Chosle, M. Douen, the Abbé Delmont, and (we regret to be obliged to add) M. Brunetière. Of these four writers M. Douen has directly attacked the reputation of Fénelon; the other three have been at pains to vindicate Bossuet at his expense. Of the three biographies before us, that of Père Boutié is in the nature of a formal defence, while Lord St. Cyres and Mr. Sanders have undertaken to tell the story of Fénelon's life over again, as viewed from the standpoint of the impartial Protestant outsider. Anything in the nature of a detailed comparison of the three books would carry us far beyond the limits of a necessarily brief notice, and we must content ourselves with some very general remarks.

One advantage, from the mere book-maker's point of view, the life of Fénelon undoubtedly possesses. Its natural divisions, chronological and topical, are clear and well marked. His early life and training, the years at *Les Nouvelles Catholiques*, the mission to Poitou and Saintonge, the tutorship of the Duke of Burgundy, the Quietist controversy, the life at Cambrai, the campaign against Jansenism, the *Spiritual Letters*, the political tracts, the last year and death; these or such as these must almost of necessity be the headings of the chapters or sections of any biography of the great Archbishop. But there is another characteristic of his life which renders the

¹ *Fénelon*. Par le R. P. Louis Boutié, de la C. de Jésus. Paris: Victor Retaux.

François de Fénelon. By Viscount St. Cyres. London: Methuen and Co.

Fénelon: His Friends and His Enemies. By L. K. Sanders. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.

biographer's task one of extreme difficulty. It has been said of Fénelon's *Télémaque* that it is a political tract, a dissertation on the duties and the dangers of princes, under the thin disguise of a fiction: And it might with almost equal truth be said that a Life of Fénelon, to be really satisfying, must needs be a didactic treatise on the duties and dangers of churchmen, of theologians, of spiritual directors, thinly disguised as a biography. There have been men whose lives were so full of stirring incident or strenuous activity, men whose character has been so plainly expressed in their deeds and their words, that a faithful and forceful record of what they did and said is all that can be claimed from their biographers. Fénelon was not one of these men. Of the greater part of his life it may be said that its details would be simply wearisome apart from the valuable object-lessons which they afford, and that the real interest of any modern biographical study of his career must of necessity lie rather in the biographer's estimate of its significance than in the bare record of facts.

For instance, even the little that has been recorded of Fénelon's work as Superior of the institution known as *Les Nouvelles Catholiques*, and of his missionary labours in Poitou and Saintonge, would be hardly worth remembering except in so far as it helps to throw light on the true principles of religious toleration, and on what may perhaps be called the psychology of conversion. These are thorny and intricate topics, not to be lightly dealt with. They are topics which no one of the three writers whose biographies lie before us has at all adequately handled, and by consequence no one of them can, we think, be held to have given a satisfactory estimate of this portion of Fénelon's life. Père Boutié and Lord St. Cyres, as might perhaps have been expected, run to opposite extremes in justification and in blame respectively, in justification and in blame not so much of the personal action of Fénelon himself, as of the system which he was called upon to administer. But there is this difference between them, that Père Boutié's principles are sound if his application of them is too complaisant in its optimism, while Lord St. Cyres, on the other hand, starting from principles which are by no means sound, treats the subject with that easy confidence in his own judgment which is characteristic of the "superior person," but which is not likely to be shared by the careful reader, and the less so when he observes that the writer's principal authority here is

the partizan monograph of M. Douen, *L'Intolérance de Fénelon*. Mr. Sanders, more wisely perhaps, considering the dearth of documentary evidence, refrains from entering at length into this portion of his subject. We cannot, of course, discuss it in detail here. It may be useful however to recall to mind some of the fundamental considerations which should underlie any treatment of it. Error which is known to be error has, on its own account, no right to toleration ; or, to speak more comprehensively, error, as such, has no rights whatever. But persons who hold erroneous opinions unquestionably have rights ; and it may be very seriously questioned, even by Catholics, whether it can fall within the scope of any human tribunal to discriminate between the culpable and the *bona fide* maintenance of false doctrines. It is the propagation of error, not mere personal adherence thereto, which unquestionably comes within the cognizance of ecclesiastical courts, and for the suppression of which the help of the secular arm may, or conceivably might, under certain circumstances, be lawfully invoked. But only under certain circumstances ; for the evils arising, directly or indirectly, from forcible suppression may very greatly outweigh the evil results of the propagation of the error itself. It is plain—and our Lord Himself reminds us of the fact—that in the effort to root out the tares the good grain may suffer, even more than it suffers from the intrusive proximity of the noxious weed. The rights of the individual conscience may easily be violated ; authority may be exercised on behalf, not of revealed dogma but of current theological opinion ; and forcible measures may engender feelings of hostility which centuries cannot eradicate. We will not go so far as to say that the evil results of attempting forcibly to suppress the active propagation of speculative error (assuming that no undue influence is exercised by its propagators) always has been and always will be greater than the good. But we can easily understand that others—better informed perhaps, and with a keener insight into human nature—should hold this view. All that we protest against is the assumption that there is no authoritative standard of religious truth, and against the modern conception of religious toleration, as a thing *per se* good. This much at any rate is clear, that Fénelon's dealings with the Huguenots of Paris and of Poitou can be duly appraised only in the light of a careful examination of principles and of their application to the circumstances of his time.

So too, the history of that famous controversy on quietism which arose out of the vagaries of Mme. Guyon, which called forth—besides a host of pamphlets—Bossuet's *États d'Oraison*, and Fénelon's *Maximes des Saints*, and which ended, officially, in the condemnation of the last-named book in Rome, owes its real interest, for us at the present day, far less to the somewhat unsavoury details of the dispute than to the circumstance that as an exhibition of the "infirmities of noble minds," and (in the case of Fénelon himself) of their redeeming excellences, it is full of instruction. And the instruction is emphasized by an issue that was almost tragical, for the story of Fénelon's disgrace, and of his moral victory through outward defeat, has, in its own order, which just falls short of the dramatic, all the elements, all the cathartic virtue, of a tragedy as conceived by Aristotle or Shakespeare. It is a theme concerning which one would almost venture on the paradox that it might be more truthfully handled by some master of fiction (one thinks of *Romola*, and imagines a Catholic George Eliot, an Yves le Querdec who should emancipate himself from the purely epistolary method, or a Sheehan with chastened style), than by a document-laden, historical Dryasdust. Fénelon duped by Mme. Guyon, Fénelon unconsciously unwilling to admit that he has been thus deceived, and hiding even from himself his own pique under the guise of a chivalrous unwillingness to condemn a persecuted woman, Fénelon involved in a self-delusive attempt to justify a false position into which his imprudence has hurried him, Fénelon embarrassed by the expressions of deference for Bossuet into which he has been betrayed by a humility which had in it something of courtly obsequiousness, and now seeking to take up a new attitude of independence without quitting his former posture of obeisance, Fénelon stung to the quick by the unworthy shifts by which his condemnation had been secured, yet nobly submissive to the condemnation itself, and nobly silent under the rebuke of Rome; on the other hand, Bossuet, fully alive to all the weak points in the armour of that whilom disciple and *protégé* who now threatened to become a formidable rival, Bossuet far more cruelly self-deceived than the man whose ruin he set himself to compass, Bossuet victorious, Bossuet successful in his ill-fated but all-unconscious efforts to prove to demonstration that the statue of gold had indeed feet of clay; these are the protagonists. And in the background Madame de Maintenon, too conscientious to be wilfully base, too

narrow and self-centred to be truly noble ; Louis XIV., whose autocratic power and temper work throughout like some blind elemental law which the clever schemer can turn to his own purpose, and which has no regard for virtue as such ; Burgundy, Beauvilliers, Chevreuse, and the other friends, like Horatio and Bernardo faithful but powerless to help ; Desmarais and de Noailles, the Rosencrantz and Guildenstern of the piece. Such are the *dramatis personæ*, if the term may be used of an episode which, as has been said, just falls short of the dramatic character for want of a catastrophe sufficiently striking.

Now of the three writers whose works we have under consideration, Père Boutié, as it seems to us, is too apologetic, Lord St. Cyres too solicitously anxious not to overpraise his hero, while Mr. Sanders, less one-sided than Boutié, less minutious and less flippant than St. Cyres, comes nearest of the three to a just appreciation of the psychological and moral significance of a chapter of history that would be altogether sad but for the triumph of dignified submission over successful ambition and intrigue.

Was Fenélon, in his dealings with matters of conscience, too masterful ? Did he err, by teaching his penitents to lean too much upon their director, too little upon God, and, under God, upon themselves ? Was his direction somewhat wanting in simplicity ? Did he sometimes encourage a morbid and enervating self-introspection ? These are questions which it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to answer. They are certainly not to be answered either in the frankly eulogistic tone adopted by Père Boutié, or with the easy assurance of Lord St. Cyres, who is confident that he knows a better way. Better than either, yet not altogether satisfying, is the cautiously objective method of Mr. Sanders. Meanwhile the very fact that such questions are forcibly suggested by the *Spiritual Letters* is instructive and full of warning to confessors and directors, and—we may add—to their penitents.

We have read and re-read with so much of pleasure and of profit Mr. Sanders' *Fénelon: His Friends and His Enemies*, that we regret to have to say, in conclusion, that we must not be understood to approve it without qualification. Although there are comparatively few passages in the work which are positively offensive to Catholics, and these we are sure not willingly so, yet the author's principles are not Catholic principles. We rejoice that on so many points he comes so near the truth ; but

we cannot forget that half-truths are often the most insidious of errors; and that, for errors of principle, psychological insight and a certain shrewd common-sense in the estimation of motives are, after all, an inadequate compensation. Père Boutié's *Fénelon* serves its purpose well enough as an answer to Chosle and Douen, to Delmont and Brunetière; and it might serve in some measure as a corrective to Lord St. Cyres' *François de Fénelon*. More than this we cannot say; and of the last-named work itself there is nothing more that needs to be said here.

We would very willingly have illustrated our observations by some extracts, by way of specimen, from all three biographies; but we have reached the limits of our space.

2.—VARIETIES OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE.¹

To any one who with an open mind has followed the course of theological discussion in France during the last few years, it must, as it seems to us, appear tolerably plain that the "New Apologetic" has come to stay. Much talked of in France, little known to the generality of Catholics in England, the "New Apologetic" may be said to have an English origin. It is the fruit of an English seed which has germinated on a foreign soil. And the seed is Newman's *Grammar of Assent*. The "New Apologetic" may be described as a line or scheme of argument based on the psychological presuppositions which underlie faith, and which make the Christian religion acceptable. And if these words are too hard and abstract, the reader may find in some of the later chapters of *Callista* a concrete example of the kind of problems with which the "New Apologetic" essays to deal.

Now Professor James's Gifford Lectures on *The Varieties of Religious Experience* can hardly be called a contribution to Apologetic, whether new, old, or possible-future. But they contain a great deal of raw material of the kind with which the apologist of the newer school must needs concern himself. The author discusses with considerable acuteness and with a great wealth of illustrative example, sometimes, it must be

¹ *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature*. Being the Gifford Lectures on Natural Religion, delivered in Edinburgh in 1901—1902. By William James, LL.D., &c., Professor of Philosophy at Harvard University.

admitted, singularly ill chosen, the genesis and the constituents of religious emotion. And his book, notwithstanding its tendency to dwell on more or less morbid and erratic psychological phenomena, can hardly fail to be of real use to those whose business it may be to handle this somewhat delicate and intricate subject. Inasmuch, however, as the book is addressed to the general reader, the qualities which render it serviceable to the few are, we venture to think, altogether outweighed by the evil effects likely to be wrought by its unsettling effects on the minds of the many. Mysticism is, as it seems to us, a topic with which the untrained and half-educated public should by all means be encouraged to leave alone. Or, if it is to be dealt with at all for their benefit, it needs to be expounded didactically by one who, like Father Tyrrell or Père Pacheu, can speak out of the abundance of personal knowledge and experience. Professor James avowedly approaches his subject from the outside. He delivers a series of clinical lectures, inviting the curious to observe how deftly he wields the dissecting-knife, and to form their own opinion on matters on which they are far less capable of arriving at a sound judgment than he has shown himself to be. We fully recognize the excellence of the author's intentions; we willingly acknowledge his scrupulous desire to be fair in his presentment of the lives of the saints; we admit the possibility that some non-Catholics may be led by what he says to take an interest in Catholic hagiology, or that some non-religious persons may be encouraged to break loose from the trammels of a crude materialism; but, on the whole, we do not think that these Gifford lectures will add to Professor James's reputation; nor do we feel called upon to discuss them in detail here. Indeed, on our own principles, we should hold that none but an expert ought to undertake their discussion; and personal experience in the facts and phenomena of mysticism can hardly be demanded of the average reviewer.

3.—IL SANTO VANGELO EC.¹

This new Italian translation of the Gospels and the Acts has been issued under the *Imprimatur* of the Master of the Sacred Palace by the *Pious Association of St. Jerome for the diffusion*

¹ *Il Santo Vangelo ec.* Nuova traduzione. Tipografia Vaticana, 1902. Prezzo, 20 cent.

of the Holy Gospels. It is designed in some sort, as the Preface tells us, to counteract the well-intentioned but misdirected zeal of *i nostri fratelli separati protestanti* whose activity in the spreading of so-called Bible-Christianity in Rome itself has awakened authorities to the need of providing an effectual antidote, such as will in some measure be supplied by the dissemination of this cheap, readable, authorized and annotated edition of the Gospels, prefaced with an illuminative explanation of the place which these inspired writings hold in the Christian and Catholic religion. The older versions, we are told, were too scarce and costly to be generally procurable; moreover, their style was archaic and unfamiliar; nor were the annotations at all abreast with the requirements of later criticism. All these limitations to the popularizing of the Gospel have been removed by the present edition. Recent studies, says the Preface, have destroyed the basis of the Protestant distinction between ecclesiastical teaching and the "pure Gospel, understood as a stereotyped, or perhaps phonographic, reproduction of the complete thought of Jesus Christ." The four Gospels, far from being distinct from the Church's preaching, are now recognized to be simply *una vetustissima predicazione*—the oldest form of her preaching. The thought of Christ is reproduced faithfully "but not with a mechanical (*materiale*) fidelity; not, for example, with the fidelity of a short-hand report." Nor was the aim of the Evangelists *directly* historical or biographical; before all else "each Evangelist is a preacher; *i.e.*, he expounds the life of Jesus in view of some particular scope of his own"—whether it be to show Him as fulfilling spiritually the Messianic expectations of the Jews; or as opposing a significant and spiritually beneficent thaumaturgy to that of the Gentile wonder-workers; or as the Redeemer of the Pauline preaching; or as the Logos of the Johannine theology. Hence the Gospels are but "an episode in the uninterrupted history of the Church's preaching and teaching." This is certainly to cut the ground away from under the Bible-Christian position. Yet the fact that the Gospels are but the oldest part of the Church's preaching does not warrant their being shelved in favour of the *vox viva*; for, first of all, they are the utterances of *inspired* preachers; secondly, as historical documents, as testifying to the beliefs of the generation that gave birth to them, they have an unique apologetic value; thirdly, though not a formal and complete exposition of

dogma, the Gospel contains the germ from which the present system has been developed: "*Certo questa è più sviluppata di quella, ma lo sviluppo non è la corruzione; tutt' altro!*"; fourthly, the Gospel is the best manual of piety by whose standard all others must be measured and corrected. Such is the scope and spirit of this undertaking of the "Association of St. Jerome." We may perhaps later deal with the annotations in particular, which merit more than a general commendation for their lucidity and unostentatious learning. Unlike those of certain ponderous commentaries, they are directed rather to securing a silence for the author than a hearing for his commentator.

4.—A BOOK OF ORATORIOS.¹

We are all familiar with the idea of an Oratorio, but few are aware of the connection between Oratorios and the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. It was, however, St. Philip, the Founder of the Oratory, who first conceived the idea of this form of sacred music, and it is because it became a special feature in the services of his Oratory at Rome, that the name of Oratorio became attached to it. His object, as we may imagine, was not merely musical, but religious—namely, by dramatizing some tract of sacred history, or prophecy, and setting it to a fitting musical accompaniment of the highest order, to assist to its better comprehension and deeper realization. Palestrina and Animuccia were his friends and disciples, though not members of his Congregation, and had charge of the music of the Roman Oratory in his day. It was thus that their genius came to be dedicated to the carrying out of St. Philip's idea in so perfect a form.

English people have come to regard Oratorios as musical displays, and to associate them with the concert-hall, but the Fathers of the Birmingham Oratory have been endeavouring to restore them to their original purpose, and for the last six years have given them from time to time in their church; and Father Eaton, under whose painstaking management they have been carried out, now publishes *A Book of Oratorios* in which the *libretti* of twelve such Oratorios is given. The names—

¹ *A Book of Oratorios.* Compiled by the Rev. Robert Eaton, of the Birmingham Oratory. Catholic Truth Society.

Oratorios on the Creator and Creature, on the Incarnation of our Lord, on the House of God, on the Life after Death, on the Virtue of Charity, and so on—show how practical are the subjects chosen, and it is enough to note the arrangement of the parts of each, to perceive how an Oratorio can be a valuable method of religious instruction. It is part of the system that a sermon should be preached before or after the singing, one of which the scope is to bring out more definitely the thoughts suggested by the Oratorio. The present volume adds six such sermons, which are by Father H. I. D. Ryder, and others. The Bishop of Birmingham writes a short Preface, in which he renders personal testimony to the impressiveness of these religious functions.

5.—DENTON, NEAR GRAVESEND.¹

Mr. George Arnold being the owner of Denton Court, near Gravesend, has gathered up into a small volume all he could find about its history, which goes back to pre-Norman times. The name of Denton, as is clear from its ancient form of Danintuna, witnesses to the place having been originally a Danish settlement. In the middle of the tenth century it was given by its then owner, Ælfswith, the wife of Birtie of Meopham, to the Priory of St. Andrew's at Rochester. Annexed to the manor was a chapel dedicated to "St. Mary," and it is the ruins of this chapel which in the present owner's eyes gave the property a special value. He has had it carefully restored, after first taking the precaution to consult experts as to what kind of restoration would be in keeping with sound principles. The present volume describes what has been done in this way, and gives several illustrations of the ruins. Mr. Arnold is also intentionally discursive, and includes some matters of archaeological interest only remotely connected with his subject. Such, for instance, is the little disquisition on "anstels," or letter-pointers, used as aids to reading, one of which he has in his own museum. He suggests that King Alfred's Jewel, now in the Ashmolean Museum, was originally the handle of such an instrument, supporting his theory by illustrations.

It may interest the reader to learn that Denton Court seems to have been the original which suggested to Mr. Barham the Ingoldsby Abbey of his Legends.

¹ *Denton, near Gravesend. Its Manor, its Court House, and its Chapel of St. Mary.* By George M. Arnold, K.S.A. Gravesend: Caddel and Son.

6.—THE BRITISH MARTYRS.¹

Canon Fleming's object in this compilation has been to furnish ordinary readers with a popular Martyrology, which may be regarded as a preface to Bishop Challoner's *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*. In this aim he has been successful, the two works fit well one to the other. The biographies may be commended for the simple dignity of their conception, and for the happy medium of fulness in which they are worked out. They do not pretend to add anything fresh to our scientific knowledge of hagiography, and the few references given would, for this reason, have better been omitted. On the other hand, the distinction between legends, which are certainly unhistorical, and those which are historically tenable, ought to have been clearly marked. The printer too has been infelicitous at times, in his Latin. It is a pleasure to find that popular publications of this sort are in request, and we trust that this one may do all the good which its author hopes for.

7.—LIFE OF THE VENERABLE THOMAS À KEMPIS.²

This is, we believe, the first time that a Catholic Life of the author of the *Imitation of Christ* has appeared in English, and although it is not a bulky volume, containing less than three hundred pages of matter, it is so painstaking, so accurate, and so clear in all its details, that one rises from its perusal with a very good idea of the character and surroundings of the saintly Canon Regular of St. Augustin. The old and sterile controversy on the authorship of the *Imitation* is not touched upon in the pages of Dom Vincent Scully, and we think wisely. The subject, however, is not altogether lost sight of, as Sir Francis Cruise, who has devoted much time and pains to its elucidation, contributes a concise and well-reasoned introductory note, in which the various theories, as to who the *Imitation* was written by, are briefly examined. Most persons, we think, will now be inclined to admit that, although the evidence in favour of Thomas à Kempis being its author may not be absolutely conclusive, that in favour of any one else is so weak as to be unworthy of consideration.

¹ *A complete History of the British Martyrs from the Roman Occupation to Elizabeth's Reign.* By William Canon Fleming. Catholic Repository, Little Britain, 1902.

² *Life of the Venerable Thomas à Kempis.* By Dom Vincent Scully, C.R.L. London: R. and T. Washbourne.

8.—CANTICA SION.¹

Adaptations of the masterpieces of Catholic Church music are very popular with Anglicans now-a-days. We hear of Palestrina's Masses, Beethoven's Mass in C, Mozart's Masses, Gounod's Masses being performed in this, that, and the other English church. The practice has so much increased in recent years that some critics fear that the works of the composers of the English school, founded by Tallis and lasting to our own day, are losing their popularity. This would be a pity. The Established Church has been right well served by her musicians. The greatest names in the history of English music are those of the organists and choirmasters who have devoted their talents to the composition of anthems. Why should not some of these works be set to Latin words for the service of the Catholic Church? The question no doubt occurred to Father Barraud, who, under the above title, is adapting a selection of them as offertories and motets. Dignified, church-like, written in excellent form, of moderate difficulty and convenient length, these pieces should be welcomed by our precentors and choirmasters. That they are associated with the Anglican Church, with the Chapels Royal, with Whitehall, with St. Paul's Cathedral, surely need not prevent our performing them in the Catholic Church. Pagan art, good art of every description, has from time immemorial been pressed into the service of the Church. It should be remembered, moreover, that one or two of the founders of the school of Anglican Church music were Catholics. The qualities of the works in question are those we like to associate with the national character, solidity, restraint, seriousness, occasionally perhaps coldness. We should by no means eliminate from our Services compositions of greater emotional power and of a more stirring kind; the Universal Church is Catholic in her taste, in music as in architecture and painting. The anthems Father Barraud has collected and edited will not set the heart aglow with religious fervour; nor will they distract the worshipper; their unobtrusive character will recommend them to the favour of those stern critics who are ever denouncing the sensational element in church music.

¹ *Cantica Sion: or, English Anthems set to Latin Words.* For the Service of the Catholic Church. By C. W. Barraud, S.J. London: R. and T. Washbourne, 4, Paternoster Row.

9.—THE POETRY OF POPE LEO.¹

We heartily congratulate Father H. T. Henry upon the charming volume, attractive alike by its graceful translations and its perfect typography, in which he has sought to make the poetry of Leo XIII. better known to his American countrymen. The selection seems to us judicious, the renderings are of much literary merit, and the notes printed at the end of the volume furnish all needful help for the due appreciation of the text. Altogether we could not wish to find the Holy Father's verses presented to English readers in a more engaging form. The variety of topics touched upon is surprising. Such versatility in one whom we might suppose to be absorbed by the duties and indescribable anxieties of his sublime office will be a revelation for many. Perhaps we can best illustrate both the range of the Holy Father's sympathies and the taste and skill of his latest translator, by transcribing from the pages before us the little poem written as recently as 1897, on occasion of the marriage of Alfonso Sterbini and Julia Pizzirani.

CONCORDI flagrant Alphonsus Iulia amore
 Incenso a pueris : unde amor iste ? rogas.
 Scilicet et simile ingenium, parilisque voluntas ;
 Amborum inde ardens pectora cepit amor.
 Relligio et pietas aluere probataque virtus,
 Ingenuusque animi candor et alma fides.
 Vota ambo ingeminant ; affulget sidus amicum
 E Pompeiana VIRGINE adauctus amor.
 Quid iam plura petis ? lectos, dignosque iugali
 Fœdere sanctus amor quos bene iungat, habes.

Two hearts—twin altars—claim
 A single love-lit flame ;
 You ask me whence it came ?
 Kindred in heart and soul—
 Love silent on them stole
 And gained complete control !
 Sweeter its victory,
 When virtue's laws decree
 Inviolable loyalty !
 At Mary's shrine they bow,
 A mutual troth to vow
 In love made holier now.
 What more ? I end my lay,
 Heaven's choicest gifts to pray
 On this their wedding-day !

Poems, Charades, Inscriptions, of Pope Leo XIII. With English Translation and Notes by H. T. Henry, Overbrook Seminary. Philadelphia : The Dolphin Press, 1902.

Literary Record.

I.—BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

The Life of Mother Mary de Sales Weld (Art and Book Company) is by Mrs. Hungerford Allan, and is the life of one to whom the Visitation Nuns of Harrow look up as the Foundress of their community. Not that she was the first who joined, for the nucleus out of which it was formed consisted of two French nuns who had been exiled from their native country, and were invited to start the Order in England in 1804. But Miss Mary Weld was the first English subject who joined them at Acton, and it was chiefly under her care and government that the community grew and thrived, and passed in turn from Acton to Shepton Mallet, and from Shepton Mallet to Westbury-on-Trym, whence quite recently they moved to Harrow. Mother Mary de Sales, who died in 1866, was a bright example of a Visitation Nun.

Three stories come to us from America. *But Thy Love and Thy Grace* (Benziger) is by Father Francis Finn, S.J., whose name always attracts young people. This time, however, he has a heroine—not a boy hero. The story is tenderly told—but we cannot say much for Mr. Svendsen's illustrations. *The Golden Lily* (Benziger) is by Mrs. Hinkson (Katherine Tynan). It is a story for boys, the scene of which is placed in the reign of Queen Mary Tudor, and is not without adventure. It contains an account of a trial, which seems to have been conducted on a method of procedure not known to history, but that is a defect youthful readers will easily pardon. *The Heroine of the Strait* (Little, Brown, and Co., Boston) is by Miss M. A. Crowley. It is an historical novel based on the manuscript diary of a missionary who wrote in the latter half of the eighteenth century. It is concerned with the conquest of Canada by the English, and seems to us happy in its illustrations of archaic French Canadian life.

Books on Preaching are always welcome to the clergy. They may be said to form two classes, one of which teaches how to preach, the other provides thoughts for sermons on various subjects. Two small volumes of the former class lie before us. *The Art of Extempore Preaching* (Elliot Stock) is by an Anglican clergyman, the Rev. Harold Ford. It gives hints which can be really useful to a young priest, for they are solid and clearly stated. *Instructions on Preaching* (M. H. Gill and Son) is by Father P. Boyle, C.M. It is not an independent work, but a handy reprint of several valuable documents—such as the Decrees of the Council of Trent on Preaching, treatises on Preaching by St. Francis Borgia, St. Francis of Sales, and St. Vincent de Paul, and so on. On the whole we may say that whilst Mr. Ford confines himself to Preaching as a means of speaking advantageously on a chosen subject, the other book enters more into the spiritual preparation of the preacher.

The Lukewarm Christian (Burns and Oates) is the translation of two famous sermons by Massillon. The text is from an old English translation, but arranged and abridged by Mr. Percy Fitzgerald.

Fra Bartolommeo and *Raphael* are two of a series of monographs on great artists, which are being issued by the Catholic Truth Society. In the former, Miss James shows us how the influence of Savonarola turned Baccio della Porta into Fra Bartolommeo of the Order of Preachers. Very fascinating is the sketch, in which we are shown how the artist cast off the slough of paganism and devoted his genius to religious and spiritual ends. Still he clung to friends whose moral ideas were not so high as his own, and seems to have had some difficulty in bringing the old Adam entirely under subjection.

Mrs. Crawford in her *Raphael* tells as much as she can in such a limited space about the great Umbrian painter and his masterpieces. From what is said on p. 82, one would gather that "la Fornarina" is to be relegated to the limbo of fiction. Still, on the evidence of his Madonnas alone, we feel the ever-living regret that (in sharp contradistinction to the life-history of his friend, Fra Bartolommeo) the spiritual tendencies of this all but greatest painter that the world has seen should have been on the downward grade.

Father Hull, S.J., in his pamphlet, *What the Catholic Church is and what she teaches* (C.T.S.), aims at "clear ideas of Catholic doctrine rather than proofs." So any one who wishes to have

clear ideas about the Church (and which of us does not?), cannot do better than consult this lucid little tract.

The main idea of *The Working Man's Apostolate*, by Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. (C.T.S.), may be summed up by inverting the Scripture phrase into "Salus tua ex te, O Israel." The one who can best influence working-men is the working-man himself, and if he is to reform others he must first of all set in order his own house—both temporal and spiritual.

Bogeys and Scarecrows (C.T.S.), by the Rev. J. Gerard, S.J., is the reprint of a recent article in *THE MONTH*. It is an exposure of the absurdities of the anti-Jesuit pictures in Mr. Henry Seton Merriman's latest romance, *The Velvet Glove*. We have also received from the C.T.S. an advanced copy of the full text of the hearing of the recent libel action, brought by Father Bernard Vaughan, S.J., against *The Rock*. It is unremuneratively priced at one penny, to meet the wishes of the many who have asked to have it published.

We venture to suggest that "St. Teresa on Prayer" would have better expressed the scope of the book which bears the somewhat vague title, *St. Teresa's Own Words*, a treatise compiled from the Saint's *Way of Perfection*, by the late Bishop Chadwick, and published by Messrs. Burns and Oates. A careful pondering of the Saint's words, the use of the Bishop's form of examination, and above all the illuminating power of domestic tradition would no doubt in conjunction help to a clear understanding of the somewhat mystic language in which the instruction is clothed. The black and white portrait on the buckram cover is a bold conception, but we fail to recognize therein the traditional features of the valiant woman who reformed the Carmelite Order.

II.—MAGAZINES.

Some contents of foreign Periodicals :

REVUE D'HISTOIRE ECCLÉSIASTIQUE. (July.)

Early Christian Persecutions. *C. Callewaert*. The Testament of our Saviour. *H. de Jongh*. Remi Drieux, Bishop of Bruges. *A. de Schrevel*. Reviews, &c.

LE CANONISTE CONTEMPORAIN. (July.)

Religious Congregations with Simple Vows. *A. Boudinhon*. The Origin and Growth of Matrimonial Law. *E. Philippe*. Reviews, &c.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR KATHOLISCHE THEOLOGIE. (July.)

John Herolt and his Teaching. *N. Paulus*. The Divinity of Christ in St. Clement of Rome. *E. Dorsch*. Eucharistic Miracles and Dogma. *F. Schmid*. Some mediæval German Historians. *E. Michael*. Reviews, &c.

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW AND THE DOLPHIN. (July.)

The First Popular Almanac—The Shepherd's Calendar. *H. Thurston, S.J.* Libraries and Magna Pueris Reverentia. *Dr. W. Stockley*. Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus. *H. Pope, O.P.* The Gentlemanliness of St. Paul. *Dr. H. J. Heuser*. Reviews, &c.

RAZÓN Y FE. (July.)

The Spaniards at the Council of Trent. *J. Astrain*. The Monumenta Historia Societatis Jesu. *J. M. Aicardo*. St. James of Compostella. *F. Fita*. The Marquess of Mora. *L. Coloma*. Modern Æsthetics. *R. Ruiz Amado*. Reviews, &c.

ANALECTA BOLLANDIANA. (1902. II.)

The Legend of SS. Peter and Paul in Syriac Literature. *P. Peeters, S.J.* The Greek Acta of St. Sadoth. *H. Delehaye*. The Legend of St. Francis—Julian de Spira. *F. Van Ortoy*. Haglographica.

L'UNIVERSITÉ CATHOLIQUE. (July.)

Our Relations with the World beyond the Grave. *R. Parayre*. M. Boutroux's "Pascal." *Abbé Delfour*. The Holy Shroud of Turin. *P. Vignon and A. Donnadien*.

LES ÉTUDES RELIGIEUSES. (July 5 and 20.)

The Decree of Messidor. *P. Dudon*. Home Rule in the Lebanon. *H. Levantin*. General Bertrand. *H. Chérot*. Little Children below the Age of Five. *V. Delaporte*. The Martyrdom of St. Agnes and recent Excavations. *F. Jubaru*. The great Collections of the Councils. *J. de Castellán*. Christian Worship in Ancient Egypt. *M. Jullien*. Reviews, &c.

LA REVUE GÉNÉRALE. (July.)

Montalembert. *Ch. Woeste*. Trades Unions in Paris. *V. Brants*. Impressions of Venice. *F. Séverin*. The Reawakening of Christian Ideas. *A. Dreux*. Aerial Navigation. *H. Primbault*. Reviews, &c.

LA CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA. (July 5 and 19.)

The Coercive Power of the Church. The Christianity of Leo Tolstoi. Rome without the Pope. The Question of Biblical Studies. England and the Holy See in 1814. Reviews, &c.

